

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, April 2, 1987

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, in whom we live and move and have our being, may we ever be open to Your leading and receptive to Your guidance. In a world of trouble and anxiety, of hostages and pain, we pray that we will be prepared to lead in the paths of service to others and along the road to peace. Bless each person here gathered and may Your benediction never depart from us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 477. An act to assist homeless veterans and their families by authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer or lease certain properties to nonprofit entities for use as shelters, by requiring the Administrator to conduct a pilot program of activities to assist homeless veterans, to report on outreach services to such veterans, to conduct a survey of such veterans, and to conduct a pilot program of contract community-based residential care for homeless veterans suffering from chronic mental illness disabilities, and by extending the Veterans' Job Training Act and expanding homeless veterans' eligibility thereunder; to provide for a 1-year postponement of the transition period for the Vietnam-era veterans readjustment counseling program and related reports; and for other purposes; and

S. 829. An act to authorize appropriations for the U.S. International Trade Commission, the U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative for fiscal year 1988, and for other purposes.

OCTOBER IS NATIONAL DOWN SYNDROME MONTH

(Mr. DARDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to designate October 1987 as National Down Syndrome Month.

Down syndrome is a chromosomal disorder which usually causes delays

in physical and intellectual development. The exact cause and prevention of Down syndrome are currently unknown, and there is a wide variation in mental abilities, behavior, and physical development in individuals with this condition.

One-quarter of a million families in the United States are affected by Down syndrome, and 600 people with this disorder may live in each of the 435 congressional districts.

I am pleased that Frank Murphy, a constituent of mine and the president of the National Down Syndrome Congress, is present today to represent the many families affected by Down syndrome.

This resolution to designate October 1987 as National Down Syndrome Month is intended to create greater public awareness and a better understanding of Down syndrome. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

WHEN AMERICA CEASES TO BE GOOD, AMERICA WILL CEASE TO BE GREAT

(Mr. DANNEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the following quotation is from the book "Democracy in America" by the 19th-century French essayist Alexis de Tocqueville:

I was searching for the sources of the greatness and genius of America in her fertile fields and boundless forests—it wasn't there. I sought for it in her free schools and her institutions of learning—it wasn't there. I sought for it in her matchless Constitution and political institutions—it wasn't there. Not until I went to the churches of America and found them aflame for morality did I understand the greatness and genius of America. America is great because America is good. And when America ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.

America ceased to be good in 1971, when America's promises to pay ceased to be good. Since then, America has lost a war. Since then, America has gone from being the world's foremost creditor to its foremost debtor nation. Since then, America has become a hotbed of drug abuse and sexual licentiousness. Can there still be any doubt that Tocqueville's prophecy has come true, and America has ceased to be great?

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress musters up its moral fortitude in making America's promises to pay in the form of the dollar good, by backing it with

gold then, maybe, America can be great once more.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION MANDATING PHYSICIAN ASSIGNMENT

(Mr. DONNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, a three-judge panel for the first circuit court of appeals upheld a Massachusetts law requiring physicians in the State to accept mandatory "assignment" from the Medicare Program for services performed.

Under the concept of mandatory assignment a physician is barred from billing a patient in excess of the allowable fees under Medicare aside from a 20-percent deductible which all beneficiaries must pay.

The Massachusetts law, applying mandatory assignment to all physicians in the State, is the first of its kind in the Nation. And although some in Congress have tried to impose mandatory assignment on a national level, we've never been successful.

I believe that all physicians should be required to accept assignment and I am introducing legislation today to do so. Doctors in Massachusetts argued that it was impermissible for a State to establish rules for a Federal program; my legislation would make that issue a moot point.

Enactment of my bill will result in savings of millions of dollars for America's retired and elderly citizens.

AIDS

(Mr. COUGHLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan was at his very best in Philadelphia yesterday.

Brisk of step, quick of wit, with his unswerving vision of the greatness and goodness of America, the President called for a two-pronged attack on the AIDS crisis—cure and prevention.

Labeling AIDS "public health enemy number one," the President said, "I'm determined we'll find a way to conquer AIDS. We'll find a way or make one."

President Reagan said, "Our battle against AIDS has been like an emergency room operation: We've thrown everything we have into it."

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

He pointed out that this year we plan to spend \$416 million on AIDS research and education, and \$766 million overall. "Next year, we want to spend 28 percent more on research and education, and a total of \$1 billion. That compares to \$8 million just 5 years ago," the President said.

But President Reagan, as well as others present, warned that prevention involves education—going to the root causes of AIDS.

"AIDS information cannot be 'value-neutral,'" the President said. "After all, when it comes to preventing AIDS, don't medicine and morality teach the same lessons?"

Dr. Maurice C. Clifford, a physician and the Philadelphia City Commissioner of Public Health, echoed the President's theme. "Our behavior is killing us," he said. Dr. Clifford said "frenzied striving and loveless sex" were at the root of many health problems.

Other physicians discussed the responsibility people have to lead healthy lives in light of the growing costs of health care borne by the general public. This is an issue we must begin to consider seriously.

FULL COOPERATION BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND CANADA IMPERATIVE TO SOLVE THE ACID RAIN PROBLEM

(Mr. SIKORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, as President Reagan and Prime Minister Mulroney prepare for their annual summit this weekend, I would like to give the Canadian leader some free, frank, and friendly advice about acid rain. While it is important to chat annually about acid rain and appoint envoys and assign protocols, the Prime Minister must understand that Congress makes the laws in the United States. Congress will have to pass acid rain controls. Congress is undercut every time he and the President do their annual acid rain jig that fades faster than the camera lights that cover it.

□ 1010

Every one of these summit photo opportunities on acid rain has acted as another rock behind which the American opponents of acid rain control hide.

The Prime Minister should be helping us remove these rocks to acid rain control, instead of hurling more of them into our path.

We in Congress need Prime Minister Mulroney to be strong on acid rain; he needs us to do the same; the people of North America need us both. Americans and Canadians stand together as brothers and sisters on this continent;

we breathe the same air, drink the same water, share the same bountiful resources. Let us not let them down.

BAHAI PERSECUTION CONTINUES IN IRAN

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am horrified to report to the Congress three more Iranian Bahais have been executed by the Khomeini regime. This equals the total number of executions that took place during the entire year 1986.

Iran is the only place on Earth where people are not only being persecuted, but executed, solely because of their religious beliefs.

Though we had some hope last year, the repressive actions of the past few months make me fear that no fundamental changes have been made in the Iranian regime's policies toward the country's largest minority.

Mr. Speaker, we will not forget the thousands of Bahais that have been jailed, tortured, and executed because of their religious affiliation, and the congressional human rights caucus will continue to do everything within our power to bring this terrible matter constantly before the court of world opinion.

WE NEED A POLICY BASED ON MUTUAL RESPECT IN LATIN AMERICA

(Mr. BUSTAMANTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, Latin America is not a remote continent—it begins 500 feet from the district I represent in south Texas, across the Rio Grande. Over the course of our history, we have tried to conceive broad policies for the region—from the Monroe Doctrine to the Alliance for Progress, which proved so popular in the Kennedy administration.

Twenty-five years after the Alliance for Progress, Latin America is a different place. Our two goals now must be the installation of strong democracies, without exception, and the laying of a foundation for sustained economic growth.

The short-term obstacle is the repayment of \$360 billion in foreign debt. The IMF requires Latin American nations to practice fiscal austerity and increase their foreign exchange earnings in order to qualify for new loans. But these measures often lead to economic dislocation, which takes many countries on a roller coaster ride. Last year, for instance, the Brazilian economy grew at over 10 per-

cent. This year, GNP is expected to show a new fall.

What we need is a policy based on mutual respect. Without that ingredient, we will have to try to put out fires well into the next century. With it, we can help tap vast human and natural resources.

AMERICAN INDIFFERENCE TO ESPIONAGE AND TREASON

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the latest revelations of espionage and treason at the very doorstep of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow are tragic enough in their implications and what may be the adverse consequences to our country, but what is more shocking, more tragic is a seeming indifference on the part of the American people about the incident as being just more of the same.

We have had the Walkers and the Pollards and other incidents of espionage and treason over the past several years, and each one is a crucial matter about which we should be greatly concerned, and yet, some people, including columnists of syndicated newspapers, are saying, "So what? It really cannot harm. The only thing that we have to worry about is nuclear war. Espionage and treason cannot harm us that much."

I hope that this is not the prevailing feeling and opinion of the general American public, else our country is not safe anymore, not safe internally, not safe externally.

We need, as a people, to guard against espionage and treason by making sure that our youngsters recognize the sanctity of being an American citizen and that betrayal of our country is the worst crime that any individual can commit.

HOUSE BUDGET FOR NEXT YEAR

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, during the last 3 months, it has been my privilege to serve on the House Committee on the Budget, and yesterday, that committee reported a House concurrent resolution to be considered by the House of Representatives next week.

Budgets are never popular, whether they are at home or in Congress, and I am sure there will be controversy attached to this suggestion, but I am proud of the work product of our committee. We have come upon a formula which I think the American people will find fair and equitable.

We have asked the Defense Establishment to accept \$9 billion in spending cuts and we have asked domestic programs to accept the same \$9 billion in cuts. We have matched with \$18 billion in revenues those cuts, to bring us to our deficit reduction level.

I might say that our work product is as good or better than the President's, but I think that will be the subject of debate in the days ahead.

There are several aspects of this budget that I am particularly proud of. Despite the fact that we have met the deficit reduction targets, we have done it with some feeling and compassion. In several areas of particular importance to me, we have redirected priorities so that we spend money where it is needed in America.

In one area in particular, infant mortality, our Nation has fallen dramatically over the last 20 or 30 years. We are directing resources to make certain that the babies and infants who are dying today can be served tomorrow.

We are putting another \$300 million into AIDS research and education. That is absolutely essential. We are directing funds to chapter I education programs that are so important to make certain that our children have a chance in the future.

There will be a lot of debate in the days ahead about this amendment that has been offered by the House in consideration of our budget for next year. I think it is a fair approach to it. I will be supporting it, and I commend it to my colleagues.

IT IS PAST TIME TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, never before in our history have Americans allowed so much time to pass without an increase in the minimum wage. It has now been more than 6 years and 3 months since the minimum wage was last increased. That is a new record in America, one that I do not think we are particularly proud.

Real minimum wages are now at the lowest point that they have been since the mid-1950's. Real minimum wages have declined 26 percent in just this half decade of the 1980's.

Minimum wage has now slipped below 40-percent less than the average wage in this country; the first time that has happened since 1949.

It is past time to raise the minimum wage.

LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE FOR THE ELDERLY ACT OF 1987

(Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation which would allow individuals age 59½ and older to purchase long-term health-care insurance using IRA funds without being taxed. At a time when the attention of many Americans is focused on how to finance the cost of catastrophic illnesses and long-term health care, it becomes extremely important to allow future generations to better plan for their health care needs. Recognizing that unlimited Federal funds will never be available to meet all of the needs of all of our citizens, we must begin to address alternative methods for achieving our social goals.

This bill is designed to shift some of the weight of long-term care financing away from Government funded programs and into the private insurance market. Currently, very few individuals are purchasing long-term care insurance, primarily because of the misconception that Medicare will provide for such care. As the general public becomes more aware of the limitations of the Medicare Program, the need for alternative protection for long-term care will increase. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will create a better environment for the growth of the purchase of such policies and, thus, assure more elderly better access to nursing home facilities or patient care at home in the future.

□ 1020

BUDGET COMMITTEE'S PROPOSAL DESCRIBED AS FAIR

(Mr. DERRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am here to speak out in favor of the budget resolution passed yesterday by the House Budget Committee.

I know that, from the outside, it is easy to criticize this document as not giving enough money to some programs, or giving too much to others. But let me tell you after spending many long hours arguing over this budget, I can say with all sincerity that this is a fair proposal.

This budget promises genuine, long-term reductions in the Federal deficit and does not rely on phony, one-time savings like asset sales.

Unlike the President's budget, this budget provides adequate funding for education and housing programs, and it does not trash rural America.

We on the Budget Committee have worked hard to come up with genuine deficit reductions out of programs which were already under financial stress. I believe we have succeeded. I would once again commend this

budget resolution to you as a fair document.

ASSET SALES, A POOR ALTERNATIVE TO RAISING TAXES

(Mr. MOODY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, this morning's headlines in the Washington Post emblazoned one particular feature of the Democratic budget package: \$18 billion in taxes for 1988.

As we consider next year's budget and how to raise the revenues necessary to bring the budget deficit down, let us focus for a minute on the President's alternative that he proposed to that \$18 billion in taxes. The President proposes \$21 billion in revenues, \$9 billion of which would be achieved through asset sales. Let me spend a moment to discuss asset sales.

Asset sales have precisely the same effect on the budget deficit as printing bonds. In both cases you take Government paper and you sell it to the public to get some short-term revenue for the Government, and the result is you put yourself in a deeper hole the next year and the next year and the next year as a result of that short-term cash you received up front.

In both cases we use private savings that should be going into productive capital to improve our productivity and competitiveness. And we borrow it; we soak it up from private savings and put it into running the Government on a daily basis rather than putting it into real investment. So on both financial grounds and economic grounds, asset sales are the worst possible way to go. They deceive the public into thinking that we have raised revenues.

If we are going to raise revenues, if we are going to raise taxes, which is the price of a civilized society, let us do it properly and not resort to asset sales, which only puts us in a deeper hole and has the equivalent effect of printing bonds.

AN APRIL FOOL'S BUDGET

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, if there was any question that yesterday was April Fool's Day, I think that ought to be put aside when one looks at the budget that was brought to us.

The previous speaker said that the price of a civilized society is the price of raising taxes. Yes; it is raising those taxes that are necessary, but not continually raising the rates of taxes, as our friends on the other side of the aisle seem adamant to achieve.

If we have no change in the tax structure at present, over the next 5 years we will have an increase in tax collections of \$400 billion, and what we are saying, if we adopt their budget, is that the American people are led to think that we are adding \$400 billion by the end of the fifth year, and that means that every year thereafter we will have \$400 billion more of their money for Federal spending. And that is not enough; they say we cannot bring our budgets into balance with this amount of money, that we need to tax the people even more than we have today.

As we are talking about competitiveness, as we are talking about making American industry more competitive worldwide, I cannot understand how imposing more taxes on the American worker, on the American businessmen and women, and on the American consumer is the way to make ourselves more competitive in the world marketplace. It leads us absolutely in the opposite direction.

So, Mr. Speaker, yesterday was April Fool's Day. Unfortunately, the joke is on the American people.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of receiving the schedule for the balance of the week and for next week, and I am happy to yield for that purpose to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Republican whip for yielding, and I wonder if he will yield to me for the purpose of making two unanimous-consent requests prior to discussing the program?

Mr. LOTT. Absolutely, I yield to the majority leader.

HOUR OF MEETINGS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT AND THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, April 7, 1987, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, April 8, 1987, and that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, April 8, 1987, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Thursday, April 9, 1987.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER CALL OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar be in order on Tuesday, April 7, 1987.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in further response to the distinguished Republican whip, the schedule for the remainder of the week and next week is as follows:

There is no legislative business scheduled for today. Tomorrow the House will not be in session.

On Monday, April 6, the House will meet at noon in pro forma session, and on Tuesday, April 7, the House will meet at noon to consider the Consent Calendar and two bills under suspension of the rules, as follows:

H.R. 148, Michigan wilderness; and

H.R. 1728, to extend the commodities demonstration program under the School Lunch Act.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, April 8, 9, and 10, the House will meet at 10 a.m. on Wednesday and Thursday and, if necessary, Friday to consider an unnumbered House concurrent resolution, which is the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1988, subject to a rule being granted.

Mr. Speaker, it is our hope that it will be possible, after consultation with the minority, to obtain permission from the House to begin the general debate on the budget on Tuesday next week, Tuesday, April 7.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader just a couple of questions about the announcement he made relative to the schedule for next week.

It appears that we will convene on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, at 10, although I do not believe the gentleman asked for the 10 o'clock time on Friday yet.

Mr. FOLEY. I would tell the gentleman that is the normal time the House would meet. It does not require unanimous consent.

Mr. LOTT. All right. But if we are in on Friday, it would be the gentleman's intent to come in at 10?

Mr. FOLEY. If there is a session on Friday, we intend to come in at 10 o'clock.

Mr. LOTT. We would have no objection to that.

Mr. Speaker, I also note that the supplemental appropriation bill that had been on the schedule earlier, first for rule consideration today, Thursday, and then to be considered next week, does not now appear on the schedule at all.

Is it the majority's intention not to bring up the supplemental appropriation bill before the Easter district work period, and are there any plans about when it may come up, if at all?

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is correct, it is not our intention to come up with the supplemental appropriation bill for consideration of the rule or for consideration of the appropriation itself until sometime after the Easter recess. The reason again is the urgency of considering the budget resolu-

tion before the recess begins next week during what we assume will be a tight schedule even if we can persuade the gentleman's side to give us permission to begin the debate on Tuesday.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I stand corrected with respect to the time of the meeting on Friday. If the gentleman will yield further, I have one more unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the majority leader.

HOUR OF MEETING ON FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 9, 1987, it adjourn to meet, unless there is some further order of the House, at 10 a.m. on Friday, April 10, 1987.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I might ask, does the gentleman have a unanimous-consent request to make with regard to the trade bill? I understood there was some unanimous-consent request pending perhaps with respect to the trade legislation.

Mr. FOLEY. Yes. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1987

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEES TO HAVE UNTIL 6 P.M. MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1987 TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 3

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each of the committees receiving referral of the bill H.R. 3 have until 6 p.m. on Monday, April 6, to file their report on that bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but I would just like to point out that this bill, H.R. 3, is trade legislation, and the proper title, I believe, would be the Omnibus Trade Act. I

want to say that I am very pleased that that legislation is being worked on in a bipartisan way, particularly from the Ways and Means Committee. I understand that it had an overwhelming vote on both sides of the aisle, and while there may be some differences about certain sections in the different committees—and several committees are included—I think that is the way this House should operate, and I want to commend the majority leader for the effort that is being put forward, and in the spirit of that effort we certainly would have no objection to his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

□ 1030

EDUCATION DAY U.S.A.

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 200) to designate April 10, 1987, as "Education Day U.S.A.," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objections to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 200 to designate April 10, 1987, as "Education Day U.S.A."

The quality of education is essential to America's heritage of political freedom and cultural achievements. Our schools are vital in that they provide for our technical and scientific competence. Education holds the key to the future of our countries higher education goals; and by designating April 10, 1987, as "Education Day, U.S.A." we call to the attention of the American people the necessity of continuing to maintain and improve our educational system.

I feel that in the future our Nation must rely more and more on a highly educated citizenry to compete with other nations of the world; therefore, we must nurture our desire for learning to motivate students and teachers to assure that we maintain the leadership necessary to continue our American democracy.

In this resolution we call attention to the Lubavitch movement which promoted many of the ethical values

and principles upon which our great Nation was founded. It is only fitting that in choosing this date we honor the leader of the movement, Rabbi Menachem Mendell Schneerson, whose 85th birthday falls on April 10, 1987. Since 1980 Rabbi Menachem Mendell Schneerson has been the leader of the Lubavitch international which is the largest branch of the Hassidic movement. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to join the many admirers of the "rebbe" especially my constituents at the Chabad House in Rockville.

I strongly urge passage of the resolution which focuses attention on America's education that is so vital to our future competitiveness with other nations.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to say a few words about House Joint Resolution 200, requesting the President to designate April 10, 1987, as "Education Day, U.S.A."

Along with the distinguished majority leader, TOM FOLEY, I am sponsoring this resolution. I'm happy to be part of this worthy venture.

As I said last year, I think it is fitting that the majority and minority leaders, should cosponsor such a resolution. It deals with a subject that transcends partisan consideration.

We are seeing a rebirth of the Old American idea of progress through education for all Americans. That's still a great idea.

April 10 also happens to be the 85th birthday of a remarkable religious leader, Rabbi Menachem Mendell Schneerson.

He is the internationally renowned and respected leader of the Lubavitch movement which actively promotes education programs at more than 120 centers in 40 States.

The Lubavitch movement, founded in the 18th century, has as its philosophical foundation three basic elements—wisdom, understanding, and knowledge.

It is therefore appropriate that the movement, under the inspired leadership of the man called the rebbe, has been so active in promoting education.

Looking over my remarks from last year, I came upon a fact I want to share with you today.

The movement which the rebbe heads takes its name from a Russian city, Lubavitch, which, translated into English means, city of love.

In the final analysis it is love of one's religious heritage, love of learning—that is at the heart of the Lubavitch movement and at the heart of our resolution.

I'm pleased once again to honor a great man and to support such a fine idea.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 200

Whereas Congress recognizes the historical tradition of ethical values and principles which are the basis of civilized society and upon which our great Nation was founded;

Whereas these ethical values and principles have been the bedrock of society from the dawn of civilization, when they were known as the Seven Noahide laws;

Whereas without these ethical values and principles the edifice of civilization stands in serious peril of returning to chaos;

Whereas society is profoundly concerned with the recent weakening of these principles that has resulted in crises that beleaguer and threaten the fabric of civilized society;

Whereas the justified preoccupation with these crises must not let the citizens of this Nation lose sight of their responsibility to transmit these historical ethical values from our distinguished past to the generations of the future;

Whereas the Lubavitch movement has fostered and promoted these ethical values and principles throughout the world; and

Whereas Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, leader of the Lubavitch movement, is universally respected and revered and his eighty-fifth birthday falls on April 10, 1987: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 10, 1987, the birthday of Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, leader and head of the worldwide Lubavitch movement, is designated as "Education Day, U.S.A." The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SIKORSKI

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SIKORSKI:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert: That April 10, 1987 the birthday of Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, leader and head of the worldwide Lubavitch movement, is designated as "Education Day, U.S.A." The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities. We also call on heads of state of the world to join our President in this tribute by signing the international scroll of honor which will be presented in their respective countries this year of "celebration 85."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SIKORSKI].

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. SIKORSKI

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the Preamble offered by Mr. SIKORSKI: At the end of the preamble, strike "": Now, therefore be it" and insert the following two clauses:

Whereas in tribute to this great spiritual leader, "the rebbe" this, his 85th year will be seen as the year of "turn and return", the year in which we turn to an education which will return the world to the moral and ethical values contained in the Seven Noahide Laws;

Whereas this will be reflected in an international scroll of honor signed by the President of the United States and other heads of state: Now, therefore, be it

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the preamble offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SIKORSKI].

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

H.R. 1049, LEGISLATION TO FORCE UTILITY COMPANIES TO REFUND FEDERAL INCOME TAXES TO UTILITY CUSTOMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address an important issue; the subject of legislation I have introduced in Congress, and the subject of quite an interesting debate in recent days.

The bill is H.R. 1049, the Utility Ratepayer Refund Act. I would like to take just a minute to describe the story of H.R. 1049. When utility companies in this country, electric companies, gas companies, telephone companies, charge their customers for that kilowatt hour or that telephone service, they impose a charge on the customer that includes the Federal income taxes that these companies are going to have to pay on their profits.

The trick is, even though they get the money from their customers to pay their Federal income taxes, they do not pay their Federal income taxes. They do not have to pay, because the Federal income taxes are deferred for a number of reasons: ACRS, investment tax credit, and so on. Thus, while they collect the income tax money from the customer now, often they do not repay the Federal Government for 25 or 30 years.

Sixty billion dollars; that is with a "b," \$60 billion has been collected

from the customers of electric companies, gas companies and telephone companies around this country. Sixty billion dollars they now have of the customers' money which they collected for the purpose of paying Federal income taxes, but which they have not yet paid.

Of that \$60 billion, \$15 billion will never be paid because the tax bill last year reduced the corporate income tax rate from 46 to 34 percent. So, \$15 billion now held by the utility companies will never be sent to the Federal Government.

Question: Should that \$15 billion be refunded to the customer? Answer: Yes. Second question: When? The utility companies say later, much later; in some cases, 30 years from now. In the tax reform bill last year, without debate, a barrier was written into it which prevents the State regulatory agencies, who would normally determine when the utilities should send that money back, from determining when the refund to the customer should be made.

That was unprecedented but it was done. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 1049, to undo it. I believe we should let the State regulatory authorities determine when that \$15 billion ought to be refunded to the customers. The utility companies, of course, are upset about that. They want to keep the \$15 billion as long as they can. I understand why they would want to do that. Look what utility companies are doing, they are diversifying into other areas. I have got some stories with me today. Here is a utility company that bought two 747's and leased them to KLM Royal Dutch Airlines. Another utility company bought satellite networks for hospitals; financial services; telecommunications. One of them is trying to buy a major league baseball team. These are the same utility companies which tell us that they really need this money to build utility plants to continue maintaining their services.

□ 1040

I say this \$15 billion is the customer's. It belongs to the customer and it ought to go back to the customer. The bill I have introduced, H.R. 1049, does not send it back immediately. It simply lets State regulators determine when this \$15 billion goes back. That is what the issue is.

Utility companies are running all over Capitol Hill telling other Members of Congress, "Oh, no, this is a disastrous piece of legislation. We can't give this money back. This would be an awful thing."

This bill does not require it to be sent back immediately, as has been falsely represented in many of the visits on this Hill. This bill restores the authority to the State regulatory bodies to determine when the money

is returned to taxpayers. That is exactly what this bill does.

We have 18 cosponsors on this bill today. I hope we will get more.

I understand why the utility companies do not like it. I would not like it either if I had \$15 billion of somebody else's money and somebody was saying to me, "You have to give it back." But we ought to give it back now. If we let the utilities give it back in 30 years, it's the same as promising somebody steak when their teeth are gone. Why give a refund 30 years later? Half the folks will be dead that paid this money in. That \$15 billion ought to go back on a timely basis. That is what this issue is about.

You are going to hear a lot of debate in the coming weeks about this legislation. We are going to have a hearing on this legislation at some point in the months ahead in the Ways and Means Committee. The utility companies are going to keep screaming that this is unfair. The fact is they are wrong. I do not care how big they are. I do not care how badly they say they want the money. The money does not belong to them. The money belongs to the American consumer and that is where the money ought to go. It ought to go on the basis of a judgment made by the State utility commissioners as to when that refund should be made, based on the economic health of that utility company. If they have got money to buy 747's to lease from foreign airlines, then they have money to refund to the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to outline this for my colleagues. I expect we are going to hear a lot and see a lot about this issue in the weeks ahead. I just want them all to understand exactly what the issue is, not what it is being portrayed as by some who have a special interest in trying to keep hold of \$15 billion that is not theirs.

NEW STRATEGIES FOR THE WAR ON POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, socialist Michael Harrington stung the conscience of America with an exposé of economic distress in our Nation. Entitled "The Other America," Harrington's book described the breakdown of family life and the incessant despair characteristic of what he dubbed the culture of poverty. Troubling as those words must have been to the Americans of the New Frontier, they must give an even greater sense of unease to Americans today. For although Harrington's trea-

tise helped to ignite a multi-billion-dollar war on poverty that now conscripts dozens of Government agencies and programs, we cannot hide from soaring teenage pregnancy rates, long term reliance on Government assistance and the other manifestations of an entrenched welfare culture.

Indeed, Americans need to recognize that precisely because welfare has become a culture, we need a cultural assault on poverty that enlists Government and society as a whole in an effort to root dependency out from local economies and from the minds of the poor. First, we must identify the fundamental characteristics of the culture we seek to transform. Then the public and private sectors must join forces to convince the behaviorally dependent of the value our society places on their participation in it. To preserve that participation, we must demonstrate that our society offers opportunities for personal growth on a continuing basis. In the long run, our Nation's ability to meet the economic and political challenges of the 21st century may hinge upon a union of Americans seeking new frontiers on their personal and community horizons.

Across the country, scholars and politicians have joined together to cast a resounding "no confidence" vote against our present welfare system. In particular, four major reports published in 1986 called for fundamental changes in the services and choices available to welfare recipients:

"Investing in Poor Families and Their Children," issued by the American Public Welfare Association and the National Council of State Human Service Administrators.

"Ladders Out of Poverty," a report of the project on the welfare of families, under the chairmanship of Bruce Babbitt and Arthur Flemming.

"A New Social Contract," a report of the Task Force on Poverty and Welfare submitted to Gov. Mario Cuomo.

"Up From Dependency," issued by the White House Low-Income Opportunity Working Group.

Given the prominence of the figures associated with these reports, no one can ignore the fact that they call for new foundations for our welfare policies—namely, the foundations of family and work. It is also highly significant that the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Public Assistance has called for the replacement of AFDC with an entirely new Family Support Program.

While policymakers and opinion shapers insist on an overhaul of our public assistance programs, some may find it difficult to pinpoint exactly what is wrong with the present network of aid. If we look at income level statistics, we find that the number of Americans living in poverty has declined in the past two decades from 17 percent in 1965 to 14 percent in 1985.

Moreover, about 2 million Americans—out of a total of 7 million—fall short of the poverty line by only \$2,000. Given the fact that the Federal Government provided some \$59 billion in noncash benefits in 1985, it seems unlikely that many of those who appear to be poor in fact remain so after benefiting from Medicaid, food stamps and similar programs. Although we must avoid convenient presumptions about the well-being of the elderly, the complex weave of our Government safety net does in fact require closer scrutiny of the status of senior citizens. According to the American Enterprise Institute's Working Seminar on Welfare Policy, "The availability of Medicare in 1985, disbursing \$565 million to 20 million patients, has helped to change the meaning of poverty for the elderly." While 29 percent of those over 65 lived on incomes below the poverty line in 1966, that figure has plummeted to 13 percent as of 1985. If we include noncash benefits like Medicare in the calculations, we find only 3 percent of the elderly in the poverty sector.

In sum, Uncle Sam merits high marks for reducing the numbers of Americans in desperate economic straits. On the other hand, the Federal Government deserves a failing grade for its treatment of those who remain in poverty. In a 1962 message to Congress, President Kennedy asked that welfare reform efforts "stress the integrity and preservation of the family unit." He insisted that the public assistance programs "contribute to the attack on dependency, juvenile delinquency, family breakdown, illegitimacy, ill health and disability." Remarkably, a survey of the effects of our present welfare system on children, juveniles and young adults in poverty reveal that that very system has failed precisely those sectors of our population that it was designed to help. Across all economic strata, the percentage of families headed by single women has risen from 8 percent in 1962 to 21 percent in 1985. But among poor families with children, the proportion of families headed by women has soared from 30 to 56 percent. The Working Seminar reports that 46 percent of children on AFDC in 1983 were born to unmarried parents. Also in 1983, teenagers had 270,000 children out of wedlock and an astounding 450,000 abortions. By 1980, over 50 percent of AFDC funds went to mothers who had first given birth as teenagers. By 1980, these teenage parents made up 71 percent of all AFDC mothers under 30.

Not surprisingly, these abstract statistics can translate into some very real suffering in the homes of the poor. Low-income subsistence presents grave material and psychological challenges to traditional family units. The American Public Welfare Association

has reported that children in poor families suffer from more frequent and more violent child abuse and neglect than children from other segments of the population. But the stress of these challenges grows exponentially when mothers and children must face them alone. And one finds it difficult to imagine how a mother who possesses little more maturity than her child copes with the pressures of economic survival. Clearly, the Federal Government's crusade to insulate poor people from economic realities and responsibilities has left them more vulnerable than ever to personal disaster of the first order.

Unfortunately, this dispiriting conclusion applies not only to AFDC recipients, but to young male constituents of the welfare culture as well.

□ 1050

We all know about the grim employment statistics for black teenagers and young adults. Nevertheless, I find it startling that the labor force participation rate for black males ages 16 to 24 has plunged during the supposed "war on poverty." While 59 percent of young black males found employment in 1962, only 44 percent did so last year. As of 1984, almost one-half of this same group had zero—I repeat, zero—work experience. Given the fact that so many residents of our inner cities cannot even obtain a job reference, let alone an actual position, it's no surprise that many of them submit to hopelessness.

In 1985, Richard Freeman and Harry Holzer analyzed the roots of black employment difficulties in "The Black Youth Unemployment Crisis." They reject simple explanations in favor of social pathologies which they believe handicap black youths before they even consider competition in the job market. In their conclusion, Freeman and Holzer state:

Black youths from welfare homes with the same family income and otherwise comparable to youths from nonwelfare homes had a much worse experience in the job market. Youths living in public housing projects also did less well than youths living in private housing. Thus, the unemployment rate among 19 to 24 year olds who received no public assistance and who did not live in public housing was 28 percent in 1979. Among those from families on welfare, the unemployment rate rose to 43.8 percent. And among those whose families collected welfare and lived in public housing, the unemployment rate soared to 52 percent.

So we have gone from 28 percent up to 52 percent with those two characteristics.

Dependence on welfare, it would appear from this assessment, not only reduces the probability of employment but at times can transform a job search into little more than a roll of the dice.

How have such good intentions produced such catastrophic results? Re-

cently, a group of scholars and public officials met under the aegis of the American Enterprise Institute and agreed that "behavioral dependency" has perverted the destinies of many welfare recipients. For too long, policymakers have presumed that destitution and unemployment are material conditions. In reality, continuing poverty has profound psychological effects that leave individuals unsure of themselves and resentful of a society that appears to have forgotten them. In "A Community of Self-Reliance," the participants in AEI's Working Seminar on Welfare Policy dissect the body of this alienation. "What is distinctive about behavioral dependency," they write, "is its moral or attitudinal component, manifest in an inability to cope on the part of the many able-bodied adults. Two of its major causes are, on the one hand, female-headed households and, on the other, nonwork. In these two areas in particular, little progress can be made in reducing dependency apart from a heightened sense of personal responsibility."

The Working Seminar participants continue:

Yet moral behavior seldom springs from resolute individuals will alone. It usually requires the social support of major institutions reinforcing what is good and noble in human behavior and blaming what is not. A weak social ethos increases the probability of personal failures. A strong ethos nourishes and strengthens individuals who act responsibly and blames those who do not—and thereby affects the probable distributions of each.

In other words, those who have lost their place in our society need society's help in reorienting themselves toward a purposeful and productive lifestyle. Handouts from Washington and open-ended training programs will never supply the poor with the sense of reciprocity they need in order to feel a part of our opportunity society. Reciprocal obligations inform the poor that not only do we expect them to be productive, but that we believe they can produce in a way that benefits our Nation.

The Working Seminar listed several options for implementing this reciprocity. First, it advised that Washington and the State governments require all able-bodied recipients of welfare to work or enroll in time-limited training programs. Second, since a majority of their counterparts living above the poverty line hold part-time or full-time jobs, the Working Seminar maintained that even mothers of preschool children must enter the work force. Third, welfare authorities should insist that young mothers complete their high school education so that they can compete in the employment marketplace. Fourth, Federal and State officials should also expect older mothers to find jobs in the private sector or accept positions in the public

sector. Those who fail to do so must feel the effects of clear and fair sanctions. Fifth, all of these cases, welfare recipients "should be expected to regard every job, even part-time and at the minimum wage, as an obligation to society, as important to future work experience, and as an occasion of self-development." At a minimum, work requirements will provide the poor with the job references that many of them need to start on the road to permanent employment. It seems to be a truism that if you have not had the first job, your opportunity to get any other jobs up the job scale are going to be absolutely nil.

In an optimistic contingency, welfare recipients will gain a new understanding of their strengths and capabilities that will empower them to undertake challenges in the job market. "The underlying principle," the Working Seminar notes in its report, "is that the welfare system must be infused with a sense of obligation, in order to build a sense of reciprocal bonds among the members of the civic community. That community best helps the able needy by including them within its own productive activities."

Since the Working Seminar and other research units have established broad parameters in their reform recommendations, it remains for others to determine how the thrust of those suggestions may best be implemented. Many in Congress admire the Employment Training Program established under Gov. Michael Dukakis. Under Employment Training—or "ET," as it is known—the State government encourages welfare recipients to participate in a variety of services designed to enhance their employability. These include job appraisals, career-planning workshops, remedial education, job training and placement services. Should an aid recipient decide to move from training to actual employment, that person will obtain transportation allowances and free day care for a year, along with Medicaid coverage for up to 15 months.

As New Republic columnist Mickey Kaus has noted, two problems have sprung up concerning ET. First of all, it isn't workfare. ET does not require work or anything else of AFDC recipients. They suffer no penalties if they reject the training and employment options and decide to stay at home with their children. Since ET does nothing to reach out to the hard-core welfare recipients within the poverty culture and inculcate new thinking about the value of their contributions to society, it's not entirely clear that ET benefits people other than those who already possessed sufficient motivation to seek jobs anyway.

Of course, these structural limitations mesh with the outlook of Charles Atkins, the Massachusetts commissioner of welfare. According to

the July 7, 1986 edition of the New Republic, Mr. Atkins has remarked, "I think workfare is slavery." I would suggest that many Members of Congress who have used ET as the model for their welfare reform proposals would find it shocking to learn that a principal architect of the Massachusetts program cannot distinguish between workfare and the labor practices of Simon Legree. Unfortunately, the old-fashioned handout mentality behind ET is not its only flaw. The second imperfection is even more serious: The program doesn't appear to work. In an essay for the January 19 edition of the Wall Street Journal, economics columnist Warren Brookes observes that "the results in Massachusetts are so poor as to call into question the entire ET Program as a waste of taxpayer dollars, now nearly \$50 million a year." From the inception of ET in 1983 to September 1986, Brookes notes, the AFDC caseload in Massachusetts rose from 86,999 to 87,460. Over the same period, the number of new applications for AFDC increased from 13,657 to 14,890, and the number of terminations declined from 10,700 to 10,544. Remarkably, those events occurred as the unemployment rate in the Commonwealth dropped from 7.2 percent in September 1983 to 4.2 percent in September 1986. In sum, the architects of ET have achieved the dubious distinction of leaving the welfare culture intact amidst one of the most extraordinary turnarounds in a State's economy during this decade.

□ 1100

Fortunately, we in the Congress do not have to spend the \$1.5 billion that Mr. Brooks estimates a nationwide ET failure would cost us every year. We can in fact turn to an innovative alternative that has proven its ability to transform the lives of persons habituated to dependency. It's called "GAIN, or Greater Avenues through Independence." This, the product of careful experimentation and a consensus between Republican Gov. George Deukmajian and the Democratic California Legislature, is now being implemented on a county-by-county basis throughout the Golden State.

Our new colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. KONNYU], played a major role in the creation of this program while he served as a Republican member of the California Legislature.

In describing the program, I'd like to refer to the testimony of Mr. David Swoap, formerly Under Secretary at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and then head of California's Welfare Department. Mr. Swoap discussed the GAIN Program in a hearing on workfare that I chaired for the Joint Economic Committee's

Subcommittee on Trade, Productivity and Economic Growth.

"In developing the program," Mr. Swoap told our panel, "we emphasized essentially two concepts: targeting and sequence. What we learned through State and local experiments in the 1980's is that in order to achieve cost-effective job placement, the sequence of the activities is as important as the activities themselves so that we can target dollars efficiently to those individuals who need them."

How is this efficiency implemented? To begin with, welfare recipients must register in the program. Following an assessment of the individual's capabilities, program administrators direct the person either to a remedial education program or to mandatory job search. At that point, Mr. Swoap reported, as many as 30 to 40 percent of the welfare enrollees find jobs. "By placing recipients in 3-week, job-search workshops," he noted, "San Diego was able to place more than 46 percent of its participants into jobs, thus saving taxpayers significant dollars in unnecessary training expenditures." According to Mr. Swoap, the mandatory job search also benefits the outlook of welfare recipients. In San Diego, one graduate of the "job club" told Swoap: "When I got out of there, I felt I could do anything in the world."

For those unable to find a position through job search, GAIN offers grant diversion. This is where a portion of the person's grant goes to an employer to help offset the wage. Intensive training for the functionally unemployed, and community work experience. Interestingly, even the work requirement has generated a positive response from participants. When Mr. Swoap visited a new class of workfare participants, he asked them how they felt about the mandatory aspects of GAIN. Swoap added, "How many of you think this program should be mandatory? Every single one of them raised his or her hand. They said, 'I wouldn't have been here had it not been mandatory, but now that I am here I find what tremendous opportunities this is going to provide me' with regard to enabling the individual to work himself off of welfare."

Mr. Swoap's observation concurs with the assessment of Barbara Blum, president of Manpower Demonstration Corp., who also testified before the JEC Subcommittee. Beginning in 1982, MDRC has conducted evaluations of State welfare reform initiatives. In San Diego, MDRC surveys showed that 60 to 70 percent of AFDC applicants regarded required work as a fair obligation. They did not object to it; they believed it was fair for the State to require work as part of the overall program. They saw nothing unfair about that, and 80 percent believed that it was fair to mandate a 3-week job search.

In her opening statement before the subcommittee, Ms. Blum commented:

These results are consistent with other studies that the poor want to work and are eager to take advantage of opportunities to do so. As one of MDRC's field workers remarked, "These workfare programs did not create the work ethic, they found it."

Obviously, this judgment meshes with the belief of AEI's working seminar that every American can become an achiever if our society defines its expectations for that person with sufficient clarity.

Greater Avenues through Independence, GAIN, thus carries the demonstrable promise of a more fulfilling lifestyle for welfare recipients themselves. In addition, Mr. Swoap reports that the implementation of GAIN may carry fiscal advantages as well. He told our workfare hearing: "Annual costs to implement the program will be about \$159 million, versus savings of approximately \$272 million, plus the added benefits of recipients contributing to the State's tax base." It's my hope that Members of Congress will turn from the siren song of ET and look toward a real workfare plan that offers a real chance for a breakout from the imprisonment of the poverty culture.

In the final analysis, however, neither GAIN nor ET nor any legislation or bureaucracy will resolve our poverty dilemmas. Amidst the monsoon of studies, reports and recommendations on welfare reform, it's disappointing that so few experts have highlighted the successes scored by community organizations in the war against poverty. Ultimately, we need to understand the unique strengths which these groups offer if we wish to properly tailor our national programs to the immense variety of local problems and needs.

The management of public housing units by tenants has provided some of the most dramatic evidence of how community efforts can defeat problems that bureaucrats and, I might say, elected officials find intractable. In the August 4, 1986 edition of U.S. News & World Report, reporters Art Levine and Dan Collins concentrated on the initiatives of Kimi Gray and her fellow tenants at the Kenilworth-Parkside public housing facility here in Washington, D.C. "Since tenants began running the project in 1982," they write:

Something close to a miracle has occurred. Repairs have been made, utilities restored and crime, teenage pregnancy and welfare dependency have dropped substantially. At the same time, rental collections have risen 105 percent, while administrative costs are 60 percent less than those of the housing agency's subcontractor.

According to U.S. News:

Kenilworth-Parkside still has some of the grim look of "the projects," but the streets are clean and there are touches of pride everywhere—mowed lawns, barbecue grills and flowers. There are small businesses and

services that together employ 140 residents. Among them are a screen-door shop, a day care center and a food co-op.

Ms. Gray, who rose from a single parent reliant on welfare to become the head of the Kenilworth Management Corp., attributes the success of the project's renovation to the fact that residents gained new attitudes toward their homes once they became responsible for them. "Poor people," she says, "have the same dreams as everyone else."

In 1985, President Reagan noted that "the brave pioneers of resident management are sowing the seeds of hope and possibility in cities across our Nation." In designing antipoverty programs, Senators and Representatives need to remember that there are thousands of neighborhoods in our country with activists like Kimi Gray. They must remember that such community leaders have irreplaceable perspectives on the daily challenges facing the poor, and that they possess irreplaceable insight into the daily opportunities for lifting the poor out of the welfare culture. Hopefully, Congress will also recall that we need to assist, not complicate, these private crusades for hope in the bastions of despair. As President Kennedy himself observed in 1962, we must marshal "the total resources of the community to meet the total needs of the family to help our less fortunate citizens help themselves."

Of course, long-term confidence about one's ability to help oneself depends to a large extent on prospects for economic growth. Unfortunately, a recent report from the majority side of the Joint Economic Committee has clouded the understanding of many vis-a-vis those economic prospects. Bennett Harrison and Barry Bluestone, who prepared the report, concluded that over 50 percent of the net increase in employment that occurred between 1979 and 1984 could be attributed to jobs that paid less than \$7,012 per year. Reports from the children's defense fund and the Center for National Policy on Antipoverty Initiatives have both seized upon this information to help justify their conclusions about our economy and their recommendations for future policy. In "Work and Welfare: the Case for New Directions in National Policy," Robert Reischauer argues that the "disproportionate growth of jobs paying inadequate wages has had a particularly pronounced effect on the employment prospects of those with little education."

□ 1110

Clearly, a reliance on this judgment leads inevitably to additional Government intervention in the economy and to the conclusion that the poor cannot

presently lift themselves out of economic distress.

In the March 25 edition of the *Wall Street Journal*, economics columnist, Warren Brookes, demonstrates that we cannot in fact rely on the assessments of Messrs. Reischauer, Harrison, and Bluestone. In his article, Brookes blasts the purported proliferation of low-wage jobs as a "statistical fraud resulting from careful selection of unrepresentative years." He cites Department of Labor employment statistics which show that from 1983 to 1987, the percentage of the highest paying job categories rose. In fact, the free market economy unleashed by the Reagan revolution created 2.7 million new jobs in the period from February 1986 to February 1987. Of those jobs, 41.5 percent came from managerial and professional specialties, the highest-paid category classified by the Labor Department.

Once we have established the true nature of economic opportunity in America, we can begin to forge policies that will allow the residents of our inner cities to take advantage of those opportunities. Throughout his administration, President Reagan has urged Congress to approve the creation of enterprise zones in urban areas. Such zones would encourage the formation of business enterprises through tax incentives. I'm pleased that my colleague DICK ARMEY has included enterprise zone legislation in his "Minority Opportunity Restoration Act," which also calls for a youth opportunity wage and an urban homesteading program that allows residents of public housing a chance to purchase their own homes at a reduced price. Enterprise zone provisions in the Armeley legislation would provide Federal tax incentives through investment tax credits, employer tax credits and employee tax credits. In addition, State and local governments could request regulatory relief from the Federal Government. In my view, it's absolutely imperative that we move to ensure that the individuals which new welfare reform legislation will train for jobs can look forward to a future of employment in their communities. Given the fact that 32 States have approved enterprise zone legislation, it would appear that State legislators have recognized that imperative.

Unfortunately, many discussions of the best methods by which urban economies can be revitalized have ignored one of the fundamental impediments to commerce: crime. Information compiled by the Bureau of Justice statistics in 1983 revealed that burglars are twice as likely to victimize the homes of the poor as they are the homes of the affluent. Households with incomes under \$7,500 report 40 percent of burglaries and 33 percent of all household crimes. Worst of all, the

leading cause of death among young black males is homicide.

What are the consequences of the crime plague in our inner cities? First of all, they inhibit the economic activity of families and individuals. In an article for *Policy Review* entitled "The Urban Strangler," James K. Stewart reviewed the consequences of a burglary for those with limited means: "The theft of a TV, furniture, or car can be devastating. Robberies of cash or checks—for rent, welfare or Social Security—may at one stroke eliminate a family's ability to pay for home, food or future." Mr. Stewart goes on to observe that criminal activity can also shatter the aspirations of the poor for the future—a phenomenon that only strengthens the grip of dependency on their lives. People may stay at home rather than take a second job or enroll in night school because they worry about their safety in the night time.

In "A Community of Self-Reliance," AEI's working seminar profiles the crushing burden high crime rates place on the business activity depressed areas need so badly: "Crime lowers property values, making it harder for the urban poor to accumulate capital and to borrow money. Crime is one of the major reasons why businesses in central cities restrict operations, relocate, sell, or close down. Businesses in high crime areas face sharply higher operating costs, including higher labor costs and investments in a security force, improved lighting, alarms, metal grills for windows and doors, and—if it is available at all—extremely expensive insurance." In other words, burglars and violent criminals have at times established a blockade between the residents of poor communities and the jobs they so desperately need.

As the working seminar points out later in its report, efforts to restore the credibility of our criminal justice system must become part and parcel of our antipoverty efforts if we ever wish to offer prospects for long-term economic growth in an urban context. Justice Department data from 1983 underscores the importance of the credibility issue. According to Bureau of Justice statistics, only 20 percent of reported crimes are solved. Fewer than 30 percent of those convicted of crimes of violence against persons or serious property crimes are sentenced to prison. Our criminal justice system returns over 70 percent of these individuals to communities on felony probation, and then rearrests 65 percent of those on probation within 3 years.

Clearly, State and national legislators, along with community leaders, need to do more to convince criminals that they take crime as seriously as its perpetrators do. The Working Seminar on Welfare Policy proposed some starting points for this effort. They include;

New methods of policing aimed at maintaining a sense of order on the streets of poor neighborhoods.

Stricter bail, sentencing and parole procedures.

Additional initiatives to control commerce in illegal narcotics in poverty-stricken communities.

I might say that the Congress has begun action in that regard with respect to the 1986 antidrug bill which is only now beginning to be implemented.

And finally Government action to facilitate the eviction of public housing tenants who disrupt community life or who do not meet minimally acceptable standards of conduct.

One of the complaints we have is that we make it almost impossible to evict those people who are destroying the very neighborhoods in which they live. Mothers say, "How can we raise our children when the disruptive elements of our community can never be evicted because they are protected by the laws that you and Congress and in the State legislatures have established?"

"Who are you protecting and whom are you harming?"

While one may disagree as to the wisdom of these particular measures, it remains true that one of the principal obligations of our Government is to ensure domestic tranquility. Places in our country where people cannot obtain jobs or even leave their dwellings because they fear for their lives and all that they have in this world have nothing that approaches tranquility.

In his first State of the Union Address, President Lyndon Johnson observed that many poor Americans found themselves "on the outskirts of hope." Tragically, behavioral dependency has pushed many of the poor beyond even the outskirts. According to the American Enterprise Institute's Working Seminar on Welfare Policy, this dependency has crippled family structures in the homes of the poor. "According to a Los Angeles Times poll in 1985," the working seminar notes in its report:

Sixty-four percent of the poor and 70 percent of poor women say it is "almost always" or "often" true that "poor young women have babies so they can collect welfare." Welfare "almost always" or "often" encourages husbands to avoid family responsibilities, according to 60 percent of the poor persons polled.

Remember this is not a poll of academicians, it is not a poll of Members of Congress, it is not a poll of so-called experts. This is a poll of the poor people themselves.

While one may raise objections to the accuracy of such perceptions, their very existence underscores the prevalence of self-destructive behavior in the so-called underclass. Obviously, such behavior is in no way characteris-

tic of a great society. And such behavior necessitates a radical break with the policies that have helped to create it.

True workfare—workfare that establishes reciprocal obligations between society and the poor—will create the needed break with the failed policies of the past. False workfare proposals that rely on open-ended training programs will leave the poor in the status quo, segregated from a responsible participation in our society that could them confidence in their country as well as themselves. As Prof. Glenn Loury of Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government has said:

The imposition of an obligation actually shows respect for the recipient * * *. By holding up a common standard of behavior to all able-bodied citizens we evidence our confidence that those who may now need our assistance are capable of becoming self-reliant. This avoids the situation in which "we," who are capable of responsible conduct and of generosity, deign to provide for "them" who, by virtue of their dependency are rendered objects of our concern, but are not treated as responsible moral agents.

In a nation pledged to equity and needful of more workers than ever before, a failure to learn from the mistakes of the past during our debate over welfare reform may be a recipe for calamity.

I hope that Members of this House as well as Members of the Senate will understand as we embark on our discussions on workfare that anything under the rubric of workfare may not be what is necessary and in fact may inculcate even further the problems of attitude and values and failure that we already have in our society with the poverty community. And that if we are going to give these people an opportunity to fully participate in our society and at the same time reestablish the connection in society between those who are currently paying taxes and those who are not, we need to have specific challenges involved in the program.

□ 1120

Open-ended training programs tend to tell people that they do not have to look for work. They can continue to train. Many of us know of professional students in colleges today who never seem to find the opportunity to look for work because it is easier to continue to study ad infinitum.

The same thing happens within the welfare culture itself. What we need to do is to establish programs that give them confidence and determine at the very outset what their qualifications are.

One of greatest parts of the game program in California is that assessment takes place at the very beginning. Those who do not need training in order to get jobs are not funneled into the training programs. They are given an opportunity to seek jobs.

If they do not have the skills to seek jobs, and there are some skills involved, they have a mandatory 3-week program of teaching in those skills and then they get involved in the search itself.

So what we find is that in San Diego County, the county that had the largest scale project program on that, those who benefit from the program actually thank those who are putting the program on for the requirements they placed on them.

I do understand why people in government seem to believe that folks, because they are poor, are different than the rest of us; that because they are poor, they are incapable of responding to incentives and disincentives; that somehow, because they are poor, we look at them differently.

They are Americans, just as we are. They respond to incentives and disincentives. If you give them a challenge, they are more apt to respond to that challenge. If you pat them on the head in a paternalistic gesture, they are less apt to take responsibility upon themselves.

As our society has discovered, the great war on poverty has left, unfortunately, a lot of people in its wake that many in our society have given up on.

It is time for us to take a look at a drastic change. Workfare is that change, but it has to be real workfare, not a phony workfare that says, "We will call it something, but we will not make it workfare that requires people to rise to challenges that we know that they can accept and they can overcome."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order of today precede the special order of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSMAN TIM LEE CARTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HUBBARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, actually, I am substituting for my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] who represents the Fifth District of Kentucky. He and I and other members of the Kentucky delegation grieve the passing last Friday of our former colleague and dear friend, Congressman Tim Lee Carter of Kentucky.

Congressman ROGERS, who succeeded Congressman Carter in this House

of Representatives, is being summoned to the House floor at this time from budget briefing in order to announce special order that he has reserved next Tuesday.

Last Sunday, in remarks I made at the graveside service I mentioned, as a long-time friend of Tim Lee Carter that this week words of praise about Dr. Carter would be heard in this House Chamber. This special time today makes that statement accurate. I want to commend Congressman ROGERS for asking for time next Tuesday so that other members of the Kentucky delegation and from all other States who knew and loved Tim Lee Carter can pay tribute to him.

Dr. Tim Lee Carter was a distinguished statesman and physician from Tompkinsville, KY, who died last Friday at the age of 76. He was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1964, and served eight terms before retiring in 1980.

For much of that time, Dr. Carter was the only practicing physician in the Congress and was a major contributor to health and hospital legislation. It was Congressman Tim Lee Carter who was the first Republican in the House of Representatives to seek withdrawal of United States troops from Vietnam.

A large crowd of about 500 people last Sunday afternoon in the community of Tompkinsville, KY, the hometown of Dr. Carter, were there to hear several pay tribute to him and to share thoughts with his widow, Kathleen, and his brother, Judge James Carter, his sister, Mrs. Vivian Hayes, and other members of the family who were there at that time.

Dr. Tim Lee Carter was a special friend to me. Yes, he was a Republican, I am a Democrat, but upon being elected to Congress in 1974, and being a freshman here in 1975, he was very helpful to me as a Member of the House, and was always one whom I admired very much.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBBARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I think that I would be remiss if I did not rise at this point, and the gentleman has given me this time which is greatly appreciated.

I join the gentleman in not only evoking the memory, but extolling the great virtues of a great Member of Congress, Dr. Tim Carter. Perhaps the angels in heaven who are receiving him unquestionably will make due note, but I think we earthbeings down here ought to place in the RECORD that I, for one, and those constituents I represent, the 20th District, at that time, my district was the entire county and included the principal city of San Antonio.

San Antonio is the only large city that has total dependency for its source of safe drinking water, an equifer known as the Edwards underground aquifer.

It was necessary that we have legislation protecting that single source of safe drinking water for the city of San Antonio. So I had to come onto the House floor to offer an amendment to the Safe Drinking Water Act that was being handled by a Democratic colleague, and who would not accept my amendment.

But Dr. Tim Carter, who was handling the minority side of this legislation, rose and immediately accepted my amendment and revealed his knowledge about San Antonio's aquifer situation. I think the RECORD ought to show that he single-handedly allowed us to have that amendment accepted on the House floor, which is the only protection we have for the single source of water in San Antonio.

I thank the gentlemen for yielding to me.

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks.

I would remind the Speaker that my 5-minute special order was actually substituting for the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], who succeeded Dr. Carter. He has been in a very important budget briefing.

At this time, I end my special order, knowing that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will ask for unanimous consent for 5 minutes of his own.

□ 1130

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE TIM LEE CARTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HUBBARD] who represents the First District, for his words on this subject, and let me state at the outset that we want to invite the Members to participate next Tuesday, April 7, in a special order in recognition and in tribute to Dr. Tim Lee Carter, who, as the Members know, passed away this past weekend in Kentucky.

Dr. Carter was my predecessor and served in this body as a very highly distinguished Member of Congress from 1964 through 1980. We invite everyone who would care to participate to join with us in the special order next Tuesday at the conclusion of the regular session of Congress.

Dr. Carter was, of course, a beloved figure in his district and in Kentucky as a whole and, in fact, here in the Halls of the Congress and in Washing-

ton, DC. He was a man who had made his mark in so many different ways and a man who was beloved in every respect.

Perhaps Dr. Carter's greatest legislative achievements were in the 1970's, and perhaps even in the 1960's, in health care legislation. He was the ranking Republican on the Health Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, as it was called then, and he was the author and coauthor of much of the almost revolutionary health care legislation of that era. And, of course, that stemmed from his great compassion for his people and for people in general, for all mankind, and also from the fact that he was a medical doctor, a physician who had spent his earlier career in treating the folks in his district, in Tompkinsville, in Monroe County, and in the surrounding region. He was a traveling physician, if you will, who would go when called and who cared so deeply that he would go many times without sleep in his service to humanity.

So that was where this wellspring of support for health care legislation came from, growing from that deep-seated concern for his people, and that concern manifested itself here in the Halls of Congress where he was able, with a lot of help, of course, to write into the laws of the land legislation, and funding for it, which was able to provide for the greater good of humankind.

He had concern for people not only in this country but elsewhere, because Dr. Carter had been, I know, to other nations and observed their health facilities. I recall not long before he left the Halls of Congress telling me of his trip to Red China, and one of the things he looked at very closely there was the acupuncture treatment facilities in China. This fascinated him because of the numbers of people involved in this rather unique kind of medical service.

So his was a life of dedication to people. He was a statesman, and I am reminded that he was an adviser to Presidents and even to rulers of foreign lands, on health matters especially, and to others as well. I am reminded of that portion of that old poem that says in essence that "He could walk with kings nor lose the common touch." And indeed that typified Dr. Carter's life.

He was a man who was beloved in Washington, a man who always had a kind word for his fellow workers, his fellow Members of Congress, and the clerks, the policemen, and all those who serve here in the Nation's Capital, especially servicemen, because, of course, he was a veteran as well, having served as a captain in the medical service during World War II in the Pacific.

He was a kind and compassionate person. If there is one thing we could say about Dr. Carter above all others, I think it is that he was a kindly and soft-spoken but fiercely determined human being who had great compassion for his fellow human beings.

Dr. Carter has gone on now to be with his dearly beloved son who left this life at age 21. That broke Dr. Carter's heart, having occurred not long before he retired from this Chamber. His son was a young man, a beautiful young man, who died of leukemia. I have always thought that perhaps that did break Dr. Carter's heart, because being the physician that he was and being unable to cure his son of this incurable disease, it would certainly break his heart.

So I would hope that the Members would join us next Tuesday, April 7, for this special tribute to Dr. Tim Lee Carter, the late Congressman from the Fifth District of Kentucky in whose footprints I am attempting to walk although without much success in filling his shoes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope our colleagues will join us next Tuesday.

THE LESSONS OF HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I continued to address the question of the fragile state of being that I am convinced we have for some time faced in two of the key organs of our Government, the executive branch, which has been in some turmoil for some time since the assassination of President Kennedy, and the legislative branch, which ironically in the name of reform has necessitated now the crying need for reform of the budgetary processes. This is a problem that the Budgetary Reform Act of 1974 was supposed to solve and prevent but which we take for granted now. I think this is at the price of the erosion of institutional integrity in the legislative process.

The whole question in both areas of concern can be summed up, I believe, as generally a compromise of integrity, either individual integrity or collective institutional integrity.

History shows that all societies and all governments from the time that we have had fairly accurate writings of history have confronted the same identical forces. The same basic questions that mankind has addressed from time immemorial confront us today.

I think that those who read the Scriptures for their guidance in life are probably the best suited to decipher the basic issues which are still

confronting us. The basic issue always has been, and continues to be, the question asked by Cain: Am I my brother's keeper? I think that is the \$64 question, and each one of us answers it in the light of his understanding.

In the case at point, I referred Monday to the fact that we have become accustomed to accepting a violation of the Constitution and of our statutes by the President, particularly in those actions that capture the popular imagination and approval, the attempt to knock off an unpopular figure, Qadhafi, but which resulted in the death of quite a number of innocent children, women, and elderly persons.

□ 1140

Our American public is not aware of what, for instance, a European press has brought in that connection. The literally dozens of Libyans that were taken in in France in the French hospitals by the surgeons and the physicians that attempted to patch up and fix up some of the children who were maimed and wounded severely in that bombing of the so-called Qadhafi headquarters but which the President announced was intended to bomb the training headquarters of the terrorist camps that were supposed to exist or do exist in Libya.

The fact is that the President usurped his power. The Congress, rather than calling him to account, applauded. Within 8 hours of the event, all the leaders in and out, on both sides of the aisles, in both sides of the rotunda, Senate and House, were rising to compliment the President. Some of us were dissonant in expressing some views that were certainly not popular. Same thing on the occasion of the invasion of Grenada. It was a popular thing. The President was able to sell it, but in doing so, he violated 4 laws, three of them the force of law because they were treaties. Of the three treaties, our country had taken the initiative in bringing around the formation, formulation and adoption of those treaties. The Treaty of Rio, the Understanding of Puenta del Esta and the others; they were all violated. Nobody wanted to look at that because it was a popular thing.

How could we stand by while a Cuban, Communist-type of preparation was underway and taking place in this place known as Grenada which very few people realized, not even the size of, well it was not even the size, geographically speaking, of the District of Columbia, and population-wise more than about 110,000 people, so that the resulting factors are being reported.

Several books have been written. One in which a military expert pronounces that as a military failure, and of course, I would refer my colleagues

to that book in case they want to know just what, from a military standpoint, was considered a failed mission. It cost the lives of some 20 American service personnel.

But everybody forget that the invasion was ordered less than 30 hours after the demise and the death of 241 marines in Beirut, and why they died, and what the almost unbelievable, heedless disregard of the Commander in Chief of the unanimous advice of the chief professional military experts our country, at great expense, has provided our President with. Not for 14 hours but for 14 months. There were some of us that were speaking out then and saying, "Mr. President, you are violating the 1974 War Powers Limitation Act," but nobody in the Congress seemed to much care. These were lonely, isolated voices that in our system, where power is the law, whether it is power political or power of wealth, that rules the day; let us face it. Our standards of success are what is the size of your bank account. If you are successful that way, then we ascribe the potential for success in every other endeavor, including governing, including politics, which, of course, sober thinking reveals that to be fallacious and mistaken.

All of these are symptoms. The fact that I rise today motivated by the same, basic thrust that motivated me getting up and enjoying this great privilege, taking the time, and placing into the RECORD my utterances, is the same as the one that motivated me Monday and the one that motivated me in 1982 and 1983 with respect to the so-called deployment of the marines in Beirut and the President never once defining the mission, not for politicians, not for ambassadors, not for diplomats, but for warriors. Of course, the catastrophic result, the loss of this American human component of our society.

I do not think the average American has reached the point that we accept what we attribute to other, less happier civilizations where we figure that in that civilization human life, individual human life, is expendable. During the Korean conflict, we would read about the human waves, once the Chinese entered the fray, and we ascribe that to Oriental carelessness for the value of individual human life.

But the fact is that we are becoming enured to that. Two hundred and forty-one marines. What does it mean to those that suffered that loss like this distraught father in Philadelphia who called me all the way to Texas about 3 or 4 months after the death of his son, the youngest marine killed in Beirut. He was asking questions. How many of my colleagues realize that those 241 marines were not considered to have died in action or in service or in combat? They are listed as having died in an accident, and this poor

father was calling me, sobbing on the phone, saying, "I have a letter from the Marine Commandant, I have letter from the Secretary of Defense and they are telling me that the regret that my son died in an accident." He said, "My son was a marine he wanted to be a marine. He was doing his duty for the country. He was engaged in a mission for his country. How can you explain this, Congressman? We notice that you are the only one that has been raising your voice and we saw the other day that you had introduced a bill that would provide a \$50,000 policy to our servicemen to be paid in the event of their death in an undeclared war."

Well, of course, I never even was able to get a hearing on that bill, but the fact remains that the advisor that died in El Salvador 2 days ago, as well as our helicopter serviceman who died in Honduras while on erstwhile training, neither one of them will be placed in the records as having died in the line of duty; they will be listed as having died in an accident. I think that is something that we should have learned since Korea and Vietnam, that no matter how vast, no matter how great a power and a potential nation we have, we cannot afford to be this careless with even one of our American lives.

I first raised this issue in May 1963. Now, who was President? The dearest and most personal Presidential friend I have ever had, John F. Kennedy. The reason was that I was invited by the commander then of the 433d Reserve Unit in San Antonio because the colonel then told me, "We understand that this family is a good friend of yours and we have a young airman that we are going to honor, and his father, we are told, is a long-time friend." I said, "Yes, I have known this boy since he was born." I went to the ceremony on a Sunday before taking a plane to return to Washington, and I was intrigued by the fact that the young man was being decorated or commemorated for 300 missions in an unknown place, nobody at that time, May 1963, if you had asked the average Member of the House or the average citizen on the streets, "Where is Vietnam?" they would have looked at you and stared and said, "Well, I do not know for sure."

It turned out that this young man was an advisor. He was a military advisor, one of several that then were in what we now designate as South Vietnam. He had been on a helicopter as cargo master, when, on the last run they received hostile fire, and as he told me, he said, "Listen, Congressman, I did not want to get shot down over a rice paddy. I ordered the RVN to fire his gun because we are not allowed to carry guns."

□ 1150

I said, "What do you mean, you are not allowed to carry arms? What are you doing out in an area where you are going to receive hostile fire and face the possible loss of life or serious bodily harm?"

He said, "Well, that's the way it is. In fact, didn't you ever get a request from my father? I asked him how he could get a .45 revolver for me to have with me, because no matter where we are, even if we are in a city, we have need for personal arms."

I said, "Well, no, I never received such a request, but it intrigues me why if you are an advisor you would be exposed unarmed, without the elemental right of self-preservation."

He said, "Well, anyway, I ordered the RVN to fire. He wouldn't, so I grabbed the gun and fired and pulled out. When I landed they threatened to report me for violating my advisory status, so the CO thought it would be best for me to be shipped back and that is why I am here."

I came back to the Congress and noticed there was going to be a briefing by the State Department. At that time we used to have Wednesday morning briefings. I noticed that the briefing was going to be conducted by William or Bill McBundy, the Head of the Far East desk, so I made a proposal to be there, and I was. When he finished, I asked him the question. I said, "Why is it that we have Americans, by what logic is this Alice in Wonderland contortion? If you are going to have advisers and they are going to be exposed to hostile fire, why aren't they prepared to defend themselves?"

"Well, no, they are not supposed to be in hostile fire." He did not understand that, and besides, the ruling regime in South Vietnam at that time, the Diem regime, later assassinated in October that year, requested advisors.

I said, "I don't care who requested them. If I have constituents who are in the service and they are going to be asked to go in uniform anywhere where they are going to face hostile fire, I want them to have the means of defending themselves."

Well, I got no response until I was invited to the White House. President Kennedy used to invite me pretty often to those so-called gatherings. I button-holed the President and I said, "Mr. President, what about this situation? I don't think you want to be knowledgeable that this is going on."

He said, "No," and he laughed and he turned me over to Kenny O'Donnell, his special assistant at that time, personal secretary.

Well, weeks later I still had not heard any kind of resolution, so I kept bugging not only the White House staff, but I tried to get information from the Defense Department and all I got was the same thing we are get-

ting now in the case of Central America.

To make a long story short, on that last fateful trip to Texas, I was still a thorn in the side of the President with respect to that and a couple other matters; so he invited me, I was one of three Members of Congress who were on Air Force One. The first place to touch down was my district, San Antonio. The President came out after we were aloft about 15 minutes and had a little brief conversation. Shortly after that, Larry O'Brien whispered something in his ear and he got up and said he had to leave, he was going to go into a little compartment they had there. My understanding was the First Lady was resting there, but as he was leaving the aisle, he turned around, looked at me and he said, "By the way, I've ordered all of those men out by the end of this year, and that includes the helicopters."

At first I did not know exactly what he had reference to. The President was great for doing that. On a couple other occasions he had done the same thing. He had reminded me, for instance, of a telegram I had sent him in December 1960 when I was a State senator. I had campaigned in 11 States for the Kennedy-Johnson ticket. I saw in the newspaper where he was thinking of appointing his brother Attorney General. I thought that would be a serious mistake, so I sent him a telegram saying, "Please don't do that. I think it's violative of nepotism. Besides, the combination of these two very powerful Offices is not good from the standpoint of the Nation."

Then I sent a similar telegram to his brother, Robert, with whom I had also campaigned and met and said, "If offered, please don't take it. You can serve your brother better in a nonofficial capacity."

Well, I never had an answer until at that point I did not dream I would be running for the House of Representatives or the Congress, until 1 year and 1 month later after I was sworn in, in fact, 2 years. In 1962 I was invited by Vice President Johnson to accompany the movie actor, Charlton Heston, to go pay his respects to the President. When we went there, the President came out, chatted briefly with Charlton Heston, seemed to be very knowledgeable about all the Hollywood gossip. Then he was called into his office and before he went in he did the same thing. He turned around and said, "By the way, Senator"—he called me Senator since I had been a State senator. He said, "How else would you expect me to have given Bobby a chance to get legal experience?"

That was the only acknowledgement I know that I ever had of the telegram I had sent him in December 1960 at a time when I never dreamed I would be up here; so that when he did the same thing, it was obviously in reference to

the way I had been bugging him about this anomalous, in my opinion, improper diversion of American service personnel under, I felt, very questionable circumstances; however, I never heard about any decision until just 2 years ago when the historian Schlesinger in a review mentioned that he had come across a Presidential order that had been or was going to be issued by the President mandating that all that personnel and equipment be back and out of Vietnam by the end of that year.

That is all I know about these events; but the reason I bring it up is that it was not until 1982 that I had two constituents that formed part of the contingent of advisers to El Salvador. One of them got hold of me the same way as this little airman did in 1963 and said, "Hey, Congressman, I'm your constituent and I'm concerned." He said, "The Embassy officials, the American Embassy officials are being paid 40 percent more hazard duty pay. They travel in armored cars. They are also in a fortress, but we who walk the streets in uniform, we have bombs going off every night over here in the capital and we are not allowed to carry any arms," and I could not believe it.

We have learned nothing since 1963, and further, this little soldier began to tell me that what everybody felt in the American contingent, particularly the CIA, was that all that had to be done was to knock off some of these revolutionary leaders and all the problems will be resolved.

It was very difficult for me to make this young man understand that there was a civil war going on in El Salvador. This was not, as Alexander Haig had tried to make out in 1981, an East-West confrontation. This was an indigenous and continues to be an indigenous civil war. If there was any country in the Latin American context of things that Fidel Castro did not really know, had nothing to do with any one of the five different revolutionary movements in the smallest country in Central America, El Salvador, it was El Salvador; and yet here we are as our national leaders have perceived since Secretary of State Alexander Haig drew the line the first month he was Secretary of State in 1981.

In the meanwhile, though, the disarray in our process, the brutality of our society at this point, impells me to rise maybe perhaps as I used to say in the State senate, that it was like a coyote out at midnight braying to the Moon. Maybe so. So be it.

□ 1200

But at least I feel that it is my bounden duty out of the love and respect I have, not only for this institution but for each one of my colleagues, for the great sense of gratitude profoundly felt in every sense—body,

heart, and soul—for the freedom of this country.

Nowhere could it have been possible for the likes of me to have been elected by his fellow citizens to all of the levels of representation from the lowest local, State, to the highest, with the particular attributes—no social standing, no particular economic base or anything—except here. And it grieves me to see that the blindness, the misperceptions of our leaders in and out of the Congress, in and out of the White House, are leading us to what I consider to be an inexorable catastrophic ending or perhaps sequel, not an ending, because what we do not see is that destiny has mandated that we share this part of the world with this host of nations: to the north, Canada; to the south, all of the array of nations down to Argentina.

As I said on the first occasion that I spoke out on this subject matter, which incidentally was April 1, 1980—and it was not President Reagan who was President, it was Jimmy Carter—the reason I rose was because for 6 months I had tried to have access both to the White House level and above all the State Department level because it seemed to me the last few months America had as leverage of moral suasive power of leadership in the New World through the established institutions that we ourselves had taken the lead in establishing—the Organization of American States.

The tragedy is that Mr. Carter did not see fit to utilize that leverage. Of course, he was involved in his reelection campaign. But I felt impelled to speak, whether or not anybody would or would not listen. The record is there.

I hate to say—I never take any pride in saying, "I told you so." I always when I speak, impelled as I have been the last few times here, it is with a distaste in my heart and soul, because I am always hoping that at least I will be 50 percent wrong, and it has been very, very demoralizing to find out that it is not the case.

For instance Monday I said that here we are concentrating, the President was bent inexorably, and he is not going to change the course of direct military intervention in Nicaragua, that the thing was being looked at very deceptively and sort of unilaterally, as if you can isolate Nicaragua from the rest of that whole isthmus.

I said everybody in America feels that we have won in Salvador because we have imposed Napoleon Duarte. I said, "But he's teetering." And after \$4 billion in 6 years of investment in El Salvador—\$4 billion that we could better use to shore up our brittle society, to help stem the erosion of our infrastructure in our cities and our communities, both rural and urban. Instead, after \$4 billion-plus, and 6 years, I said this Monday, before there

was any report that one of our servicemen was killed, because it had not happened Monday, but I was just merely trying to convey to my colleagues a more realistic perception of what that world is there now today.

If President Kennedy were President today and he were to broach his Alliance for Progress, I would say, "Mr. President, it isn't going to work in 1980. It's another world down there. It's gone forever."

The 1960 context was fine. The President could announce a unilateral program, which is what the Alliance for Progress was. We could have Fidel Castro hootin' and hollering and saying, "It won't work, because those Americanos don't have the gold to support a meaningful Alliance for Progress."

Well, it turned out that that was correct, but that was not 100-percent correct. There were other factors that we could not comprehend and we could not have handled anyway, because that was another world. The world has changed.

It is the same thing with respect to Europe. It is the same thing with respect to what is happening to us, but that we do not perceive. We like to think that say the Republic of Mexico is less savory and less stable, but the Republic of Mexico, for instance, has not had one national leader assassinated since 1923. We in the United States just in one 10-year period had four either assassinated or attempted assassinations, and one more in 1981 with the attempt on President Reagan's life.

We do not like to look upon ourselves as having a banana republic, if you will pardon that expression, type of instability, but let me point out why I said what I said, that America had reached this point of the sacrament of decision. It is not for us to say that we will endure as we understand our Constitution and Government, to celebrate its real 200th year in 1989. We will not celebrate the 200th anniversary of our form of government until 1989, when we had the first Congress that year, in March, with the implementation of the Constitution which had been adopted finally. We are celebrating the 200th anniversary of the writing of the Constitution.

I pointed out Monday that at this precise time in that year, in the spring, the sessions had opened in Philadelphia, and you had men like John Adams, great brilliant minds, Jefferson, overseas, our Ambassador to Paris, John Adams, our Ambassador to London.

They got concerned, and John Adams wrote this beautiful treatise. In fact it was published and printed and reprinted three times by the time the Convention finished its business. These were missives that John Adams wrote to men like James Madison,

Mason, and the others, and Wilson who were actively involved in the writing of the Constitution.

He was saying, "Hey, look, whatever it is you do, the lesson of mankind and government and preservation of freedom and trying to ensure democracy is that you have a division of powers, counterbalance of powers. You cannot have and preserve freedom with an overweening deposit of power in any one of these branches."

And then he quoted the great experiences. He referred to Cicero and how he was trying to stem that erosion of the republic, the republic which had enabled Rome to become an empire. Cicero was quite futilely trying to stem what was going to be the era of the Caesars, the loss of the republic and the infusion of alien cultural ways of life. The rest is history.

□ 1210

What we are experiencing at this point is whether we too will have a reaffirmation and a sacrament of decision as the prophet Elijah described when he planted the question before the Israelites as to who do you follow, the false god or the true God, and it was only after a test of fire that the Israelites said, oh, yes, we believe in the God, the true God. And in America today we Americans are being asked to pass on this great occasion as to whether or not we will have the resources for each one of our countervailing powers to rise to the occasion, in this case the first branch, article I, the Congress, and say to the President, we have not yet abdicated the Constitution to a willful and a power-seeking President. We are not going to allow any further a repetition of the errors that have been costly in blood and treasure to our Republic, as the cases in Southeast Asia amply reveal.

Had you not had the results in Southeast Asia, I doubt seriously we would have had the Iranian hostage-taking experience, because with each one of those the Nation has lost credibility. This is what is happening now.

I talk about the need to realize that we must share our destiny with these nations, at least in the Western Hemisphere, with the wit and the will that our country stands for. All I believe is necessary is just stand true to the basic revolutionary principles that America stands for and has stood all along. It is interesting to note that most every single revolutionary movement since Ho Chi Minh in the 1950's always referred to the American Revolution as their patron saint of revolutions, and that that was their hope, that was what they were struggling for, to throw off a foreign tyrannical yoke. And this is true today, and I firmly believe that in our contests such as they are described today on this earthly globe that that country

which best understands revolution is the one that is going to triumph.

We cannot abdicate and go back and take the role of the corrupt and tyrannical kings who are trying to prevent the independence of these yearning nations for freedom, and we are not going to succeed any more than those kings did. And it is written, what we see now, which I think is susceptible of misunderstanding as reflected by the President's remarks the day before yesterday after the announcement of the death of the serviceman, the adviser. Here we had about 100 guerrillas attacking the most powerful army base in El Salvador, and they were able to commit mayhem at will. This was a place that just a few months ago we had a recital, a chorus of testimony about how we had succeeded, how at least we had a sponsored election that we paid for, lock, stock and barrel in El Salvador, giving us stability. But the truth of the matter was that that is illusory and self-deceptive, because at the same time we were inaugurating with our curious attack helicopters, terrible attacks on huddled, frightened elderly peasants, not revolutionaries. We have been responsible for the mass destruction of more human beings in El Salvador alone than anything the Communists have done. Like it or not, it is not a pleasant thing to say, but it is the truth. And what is it for?

We have heard comments since the President's that this proves, the death of this serviceman in El Salvador proves how we have to stand fast and fight those dirty Communists. But what about the serviceman who died in Honduras? What are the actual facts there? Do we blame the nasty Communists for that? What about these 17 other servicemen that have died in that Central American section of the New World? They were active duty servicemen. They have not even been visible. But nevertheless, we must ask the question: Wherein is the responsibility of the Congress? The Congress should know by that that its attempt to sanitize a nasty affair for which actions our Government, meaning our people, have been convicted before the World Tribunal of Justice as guilty of the crime of state terrorism against Nicaragua. There is not one country that sympathizes with our actions. I will not even dignify it by calling it a policy because it is not. Canada does not. None of the major Latin American countries do. The only ones that make clucking sounds are those we completely dominate, as we do Honduras. We are occupying Honduras. We have never been invited. The assembly in Honduras has never once—in fact, they have had some resolutions protesting the American military presence. That does not get reported up here, but these are the things that are going on.

We are totally unaware of the history, the culture of each one of the individual nations that you cannot lump all together any more than you can say that the revolutions in Nicaragua, the revolutions in El Salvador which have been ongoing since 1932 when you had a similar uprising there that was also costly in blood, you had over 35,000 Salvadorans die in that attempt, but those were days in which like 1929 where the policies or the practices that President Reagan seems to have adopted might have worked in 1929 with Calvin Coolidge when we invaded Nicaragua and stayed there for 13 years while we imposed both the civil guard or the national guard and Somoza.

Now we have got to face the facts, because we are living in such a world that its texture is entirely different. Through electronic communications the world has shrunk. The people in the mass, and I am talking now about 80 million more than we have total population in the United States, are no longer going to accept the oppression and the tyranny that they have had to take for 300 years. Those days are gone, nothing.

Now if we want to credit communism, which is not true, with these aspirations, so be it. All we will be doing is the very thing we say we want to prevent, and that is communistic, or in the name of communistic or Marxist-Leninist jargon the takeover of these countries, we ourselves in our perceptions and in our fears, distorting the world, such as it is there, will bring about and are going a long way in bringing about the very things we say we do not want to.

I have spoken this way back home. I do not take this forum to speak one way and another way back home, and I have introduced resolutions of impeachment, which is what I was speaking about Monday. And I want to point out how fragile we are.

I was one of 28 that voted no in 1965 when the resolution calling for the 25th amendment to our Constitution was entertained. I just could not believe that an American Congress that would concoct such a resolution, but it did, and it went through, and three-fourths of the States adopted it.

□ 1220

Ever since then, I have introduced and reintroduced repealer resolutions, and I will tell you why: Because it is like the sword of Damocles hanging over our head. I am going to refer to it because I think so many do not know what the 25th amendment is, and why we are so vulnerable, especially now.

Section 1 of the 25th amendment:

In case of the removal of the President from the office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

That is fine. That has always been the case.

Section 2:

Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

Well, we did that twice, for the first time in our history some 12 years ago. We ended up with the first two unelected Vice Presidents in history. Which, the men who wrote the Constitution I am sure have turned over in their graves 50 times. That is exactly what they did not ever want to happen.

Now let us go to section 3:

Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

Acting President. For the first time, a constitutional phrase, "Acting President."

Let us go to the more formidable and ominous section 4:

Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide—

And as far as I know, the Congress has yet to provide that.

Look here: The Vice President and a majority of the principal officers of the executive departments. When I read this, I went to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary at that time, the Honorable Manny Celler, and said, "Manny, what about this? This doesn't look at all logical or it looks very dangerous" and he kind of got perturbed with me. He was battling there, and he got—he just—I said, "What do you mean by that?"

He said, "Well, anybody knows that that means the Cabinet." Well, I did not want to argue any longer. I came back; but my question was not answered, so other questions were not answered, so I ended up voting "no," but I was the only one that placed in the record my reasons for voting "no."

Now—

Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

All right. What do we have here?

In 1974, Alexander Haig and then-Secretary Kissinger both told Mr. Nixon that if he did not resign, they were going to invoke this amendment, this section 4.

So what I had feared in 1965, that this was evocative of the old days of intrigue of the Roman Senate and the Catalinian conspiracies, and the orations of Cicero, trying to argue against those. We have them. We have that for the first time in American Government history; we have that potential.

It is more in modern times, as I said on the floor that day, is reminiscent of that French Republic that was about to cave in under the assault of the German invasion—full of intrigue and corruption, and fight for power among these contending personalities, all within the framework of the French Republic then.

Everybody seemed to think I was out of my water and probably a little loco.

All right. So they transmit this to the Congress. Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives—now mind you, this is a President that is disabled.

His written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office, unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, their written declaration that the President is unable; in other words, still unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, notwithstanding that the President is saying, "I am able to come back."

Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, * * *

Can anyone foresee that? Of course we can. We have an aging President with cancer in the Office. We have a President that almost instantaneously, as of the month of November 1986, lost all of this image, and credibility factor.

The Congress keeps probing what unquestionably has yet to be probed on this so-called malodorous Iran question. That will be the point which I predict, and I would not be surprised that it would be as soon as May and June when the President, to take away the attention as he did in the case of the marines dead in Lebanon, will invade Nicaragua.

After all, he has political generals like Paul Gorman, the former southern command general saying, "An invasion by our troops of Nicaragua is the equivalent of a 2-day training exercise for our Army."

Well, I remember when I was in college, and in high school, and they were talking about Japan. In 1936, they sent the *Panay*—this was an American gunboat in the Yantzee or Yellow River, I forget which—and there was a great alarm about these "darn Japanese" and everybody was saying, all the military experts and our leaders were saying: "Ha. Japan? We'll wipe it off in 4 weeks' war. Wipe it off, wipe it off the face of the Earth. Just 4 weeks' war." Well, it took 4 years.

I say that that is not the point at all. The point is that military solutions, which is what this administration and this President have been prescribing, unilaterally, without any attempt of diplomacy, are mistaken notions that are bound to lead us to catastrophe, to great loss of blood and treasure, and leave us leaderless in the new world, with hatred abounding; where we could, with wit and will, be the real leaders, as we have been, and accept it; and where we can in conjunction with the new world find the normal and natural outlet through give and take of our commercial and agricultural productions, bring a felicitous arrangement rather than one hate-filled and forever proscribing our future generations to an era of hatred and ill will, among these that should be good neighbors.

I say let us heed this. Also, let us really heed the people from America who have worked for years, the priests, the missionaries, the teachers, the doctors that have lived down there, know what it is; let us heed them instead of having the FBI raid their offices and intimidate them on the return from a trip to Nicaragua.

Let us heed, let us use some common sense. There is no need, unless this is a premeditated coldly calculated way of doing things which, as I describe as a catastrophic decision.

I cannot help but believe that there would be enough voices. I noticed just a few days ago, in fact the day before yesterday, there were at least three Members of the other body, the same party as the President, who said, "Mr. President, unless you make some effort to go diplomatic, we're not going to support you any longer."

□ 1230

Now that is our hope. Our hope is in this body, that at the time of the greatest in need for the American people to have the system working, that its Representatives rise to the occasion no matter how much unpopularity may attach to it politically for the time being.

We have got to trust the judgment, the good will that is inherent in the overwhelming preponderant majority of the American people. I certainly have, because I would not be here had I not relied on that faith.

But at this time, Mr. Speaker, I as unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD we place an article appearing in the New York Times Magazine of March 29 entitled: "Poetry and Power in Nicaragua," by Francisco Goldman, who is not necessarily enamored with the Sandinistas nor the Nicaraguan revolution, but it is a good article because it brings out the poet nature of a great people.

It was Nicaragua that gave the outstanding poet of the century, Ruben Dario, who wrote poem after poem synthesizing what you want to call the Latin American or Spanish American ethos and spirit with regard to the United States.

He was a great admirer of Walt Whitman. He also described Theodor Roosevelt as the predecessor of "You the blue-eyed, who will be the future invaders of our nation."

These are the things and the people and the minds and the philosophies and the poetry that we ought to become acquainted with because at least this article has a very good summation of the context of the literary effort in the light of the revolutionary developments. But like in all revolutions, the Mexican Revolution, for instance, was institutionalized. The official party is the institutionalized party, and yet they had to recognize that time marches on. You cannot freeze a revolution. Yet you are in that 30-year bloody period of the Mexican revolutionary active phase.

You had great things. You had actual harassment, if not persecution of the church. We had literally hundreds of priests, archbishops, and bishops in exile in San Antonio alone during that period. I did not hear anybody talking about the infamous persecution of the church during the Mexican revolutionary period. Why? Because there was a lot of sympathy for those conditions that the revolution was trying to finally, in desperation, protest against and change, if possible. For whatever reason, good or bad, the clergy and the church was associated with the powers that were entrenched and had oppressed the people. It is the same thing with our revolutions.

We in America do not understand because revolutions, civil wars, mean father against son, brother against brother, mother against daughter. May God preserve us. We suffered the devastating Civil War. May God forever, forever allow America to remain free, untouched by such strife. But we cannot be responsible for those actions that we have become responsible for that we have been found guilty and convicted before the International Tribunal of Justice. It is not right and we cannot prevail. We must summon forth the heritage that America stands for, even now, even among the

people and the peasants who are writing poetry in Nicaragua right now. They will say, "The American people are not against us. It is Ronald Reagan and his government."

Rightly or wrongly, I think this epitomizes the inherent admiration for this great land of ours. I say let us capitalize on that. Let us give that thing which the world is asking for more than a neutron bomb or space wars or whatever you want to call them; moral, suave power of integrity. That is what the world is clamoring for, that is what America is unchallenged in.

Let us just be loyal to that heritage. The aforementioned article follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine, Mar. 29, 1987]

POETRY AND POWER IN NICARAGUA
(By Francisco Goldman)

Sergio Ramirez Mercado, the Vice President of Nicaragua, has written a new book. It is first literary work since the revolution that ousted the 45-year Somoza dynasty in July 1979 and brought the Sandinista National Liberation front to power. First published early last year in Spain and then by Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, the Sandinista publishing house, the book is entitled "Estás en Nicaragua"—"You are in Nicaragua."

Ramirez, 44 years old, is frequently cited by Western diplomats in Managua as one of the most skillful of the Sandinista leaders. As Vice President, he oversees such disparate areas as roads and bridges, education, and the criminal justice system. He sits on the nation's economic planning council, and he is President Daniel Ortega Saavedra's close adviser on foreign policy. But long before the world was aware of the Sandinista front, Ramirez had a reputation as one of Latin America's promising young writers. The author of two novels—one of which, "Te dio miedo la sangre," has been translated into 14 languages and is available in the United States in a British edition as "To Bury Our Fathers"—he has also published a collection of short stories and three volumes of essays.

In his new book, a mosaic of reminiscences and essays, Ramirez presents an intellectual's self-portrait, a picture of the writer as revolutionary and political leader.

"I'm a politician out of necessity," says Ramirez, sitting behind a wide desk in his office in Managua. "I'd rather be just a writer. But, of course, I don't see a situation arising in the future in which I could devote myself solely to writing." His participation in the Sandinista revolution, he adds, "has been the greatest privilege of my life."

As the most prominent writer in power in Latin America, Ramirez is at the center of the controversy over the Sandinistas' attitude toward freedom of expression in the arts. He insists that his Government maintains a policy of complete artistic freedom, and that the Sandinistas have expanded the possibilities for cultural participation to all sectors of Nicaraguan society. Nicaragua, he says, is a country "whose people have unlimited admiration for the values of poetry, of poetic inspiration." "Our poets," he says, "have always been at the vanguard of whatever has been most contemporary in Latin America."

Yet it is this very tradition of individual artistic expression and accomplishment that

a number of Nicaragua's intellectuals are now worried about, and that some even accuse the Sandinistas of having intentionally undermined. In Nicaragua's volatile setting, in which every act of oppression is justified by the Sandinistas as an emergency measure prompted by United States aggression and the war against the contras, the United States-supported rebels, the role of the writer in a revolutionary society is the subject of a continuing debate.

If Ramirez has a counterpart in the opposition, it is Pablo Antonio Cuadra, a poet of international reputation, and—until the Sandinistas closed it down last summer—the editor of long-censored *La Prensa*, Nicaragua's only opposition newspaper. Cuadra, 74, has been a literary mentor to generations of young Nicaraguan poets, many of whom he published on *La Prensa*'s literary page.

In a 1984 essay published in *Vuelta*, a Mexican magazine, Cuadra wrote of the "Stalinization" of the Nicaraguan arts under Sandinista rule. Sergio Ramirez keeps a copy of the essay on his desk, its offending passages highlighted in yellow marker. In it, Cuadra accused the Sandinistas of insisting, like Castro in Cuba, that arts and letters should serve the revolution. Speaking last summer while vacationing in Ecuador, he reiterated the point: "If a writer is useful for anything, it's to break with propaganda. That's one of his obligations."

For many supporters of the Sandinista revolution, Sergio Ramirez is a moderate who personifies the hope that Nicaragua might one day evolve into a stable society, representative of that often-sought political "missing link," socialism with a human face. But he is not the only politically powerful writer in Nicaragua today. Among the Sandinistas there is Ernesto Cardenal, the famous poet-priest and the current Minister of Culture; the poet Rosario Murillo, wife of President Ortega and head of the powerful Sandinista Association of Cultural Workers, and a Sandinista commander, Omar Cabezas, whose *Guerrilla memoir*, "Fire From the Mountain," is the largest-selling book in Nicaraguan history.

For a while, the Sandinista writers seemed to insure a revolution that would protect freedom of thought and expression. How could writers of the stature of Sergio Ramirez and Ernesto Cardenal, so close to the very center of power, endorse censorship? Yet last year, even before the closing of *La Prensa*, the Roman Catholic Church's radio station was shut down. And now, more than seven years after the "triumph," as the Sandinista revolution is called, there is no dissenting voice accessible to the general public through the nation's media.

At issue in the argument over artistic freedom is the ideological nature of the revolution itself. The crushing circumstances faced by writers and artists in the Soviet bloc and Cuba are recognized throughout the West as one of the defining evils of Communist totalitarianism. The Sandinistas claim their ideology to be nationalist-revolutionary, borrowing from Western liberalism as well as from Marxism—though under Sandinista rule Nicaragua hardly resembles a coherent fusion of these influences. It is a country whose poetic tradition is regarded as a national treasure, but the true legacy of that tradition is individual artistic expression.

The Sandinista arts program was conceived to expand cultural participation (and literacy) beyond an educated elite. The Ministry of Culture, created after the revolu-

tion, for example, sponsors poetry workshops in 24 popular culture centers established for the general public throughout the nation. The Sandinista Association of Cultural Workers, by contrast, is for artists who have reached a level of accomplishment.

At the association's headquarters, the Casa Fernando Gordillo in Managua, poets, painters, dancers and the like are provided opportunities to pursue their arts. There are regular classes and readings, as well as theater, jazz and dance performances; it is also the home of a number of artists' unions, whose function, in the words of Rosario Murillo, is to "help creators disseminate their work, both here and abroad."

The results of these efforts are in many ways evident. For the first time, movies are actually being made in Nicaragua by nationals. Editorial Nueva Nicaragua has published more than 150 books, at prices that even poor Nicaraguans can afford. A volume of poetry receives a printing of at least 7,000 copies. Not all the published books are overtly political; some are by other Latin American and Spanish authors, including literary classics of this and previous centuries.

But the "democratization of culture," as the Sandinistas call it, can be interpreted as an effort to impose ideological uniformity as well. All publishers in Nicaragua are either affiliated with the Government or, if independently owned, pro-Government. In Managua's few bookstores, Sandinista-published books and magazines predominate, along with books donated by Cuba and the Soviet Union. The nonpolitical works of opposition writers, published before the revolution elsewhere in Latin America or by the writers themselves are harder to find, although still available. Overtly anti-Sandinista writing is nowhere for sale. The Sandinistas attribute the dearth of books imported from the non-Communist West to the shortage of hard currency caused by economic crisis.

Through the Ministry of Culture's poetry workshops, hundreds of "common people"—soldiers, policemen, peasants—have become involved in the country's cultural life. But many writers feel that the workshops pressure developing writers into writing politicized propagandistic verse, and that the workshop poets are favored by the cultural bureaucracy, such as the Ministry of Culture's literary magazine *Poesia Libre*, and Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

Sergio Ramirez says there are no "dissident" writers in Nicaragua, and it is true that a majority of Nicaragua's young artists identify with the Sandinista revolution, the most dramatic collective event of their lives. In their work, many feel impelled to celebrate it. They consider themselves cultural workers. The Association of Cultural Workers organizes these artists into cultural brigades that travel to the war zones, where the Sandinistas battle the contras, to read and perform for the troops.

Since the turn of the century, Nicaragua has granted great prestige to its literary artists. Its poetic tradition—of a quality and diversity improbable for a country so small—is respected throughout the Spanish-speaking world.

Rubén Darío, who was born in 1867, is credited by succeeding generations of Latin American and Spanish writers with having revived Spanish poetry after more than a century of mediocrity. In the 1920's and 30's, the Vanguardia movement, a group of rebellious intellectuals, actively rejected the culture of the bourgeois-elite and its poets

who pompously imitated Dario. Vanguardia produced, among others, Pablo Antonio Cuadra.

From the succeeding generation came Ernesto Cardenal and Carlos Martinez Rivas, considered by many to be the most important Nicaraguan poet since Dario. The Sandinista revolution has produced its own poet-celebrities, including the precocious Leonel Rugama, who died in guerrilla combat at the age of 20.

Inevitably, Nicaragua's writers have been drawn into their country's turbulent politics. Dario claimed to loathe politics, but he felt compelled to write many anti-imperialist essays and newspaper editorials; he even inaugurated the Latin American protest poem with his fierce "Ode to Roosevelt."

Salomón de la Selva was active as a campaigner in the United States on behalf of Gen. Augusto César Sandino when Sandino's peasant army was fighting the United States Marine occupation forces in Nicaragua in the 1920's and early 30's.

By 1935, the leading Vanguard poet, José Coronel Urtecho, believing a military dictator would put an end to the country's long history of civil wars, supported Anastasio Somoza García. Somoza used the prestige of the Vanguardia intellectuals to help establish himself, then ignored and humiliated them. Today, Urtecho supports the Sandinistas.

It was a poet, Rigoberto López Pérez, who assassinated the first Somoza, at a ball in 1956, and was himself beaten and shot to death on the dance floor.

To Sergio Ramirez, the Sandinista front has always represented a cultural revolution as much as a socioeconomic one. His new book, "Estás en Nicaragua," is a synthesis of themes that have long preoccupied him: literature and politics, Central American culture and history. The book was occasioned by a visit he made, during one of his frequent diplomatic tours, to the Paris grave of his friend, the Argentine novelist and Sandinista supporter Julio Cortázar, on the first anniversary of Cortázar's death.

Ramirez's generation is a product of the 1960's and 70's, decades of tyranny and violence in Central America. In "Estás en Nicaragua," scenes of student massacres and university closings are memorably evoked. Many of Ramirez's young writer friends fell victim to what he calls "the cultural product par excellence" of the region's oligarchs: the death squad. But for the writer, exile was often the best choice, not merely the safest, for the same reason that Dario and so many other Central American writers since have chosen that path: the intellectual climate was stultifying. Ramirez himself lived for several years in West Berlin, until the Sandinista front beckoned him home in 1974.

Under the Somozas, writes Ramirez in his new book, the cultural style of the ruling classes was "Miami kitsch," while the peasant majorities continued to live in a state of illiteracy and enforced ignorance. It is against that reality that the Sandinistas justify, often dogmatically, their program of "democratization of culture."

In "Estás en Nicaragua," Ramirez presents Julio Cortázar as the paradigm of the revolutionary artist: uncompromisingly adventurous in his work, politically committed in his life.

Ramirez, in his 20's, was just beginning to write when he read for the first time Cortázar's masterpiece "Rayuela" (in English, "Hopscotch"). An "anti-novel," a revolt against prosaic literary language, the anti-

linear story in "Rayuela" concerns Latin expatriates in Paris and their eventual homecoming. It is brilliantly comic, full of intellectual parody and a manner of slapstick, surreal episodes.

"Rayuela" liberated our language, absolutely," says Ramirez.

For Ramirez, the revolutionary literary esthetics of novels such as "Rayuela, Gabriel García Márquez's "One Hundred Years of Solitude," and other works representative of the so-called "boom" in Latin American fiction during the 1960's fed easily into his developing esthetic of political revolution. In their creative freedom, the boom writers exemplified personal freedom; they also freed other politically attuned writers from their presumed obligation to write realistic novels of protest. The boom writers created new literary forms and authentic Latin American voices, uncontaminated by political rhetoric. Asserting themselves against the cultural domination of the United States and Europe, and defying the provincial tastes of the bourgeois elite at home they did many of the very things that young intellectuals like Ramirez believed actual revolutionaries could do.

A large, intensely thoughtful man who discusses literary subjects with animation, Ramirez today staunchly defends the Sandinistas' controversial arts program, rejecting the accusations of Pablo Antonio Cuadra and others that the Sandinista Government has imposed totalitarian strictures on expression. It is the predictable questions that transform him into a wearied politician giving predictable answers: La Prensa was closed, he intones, because it was receiving money from the Central Intelligence Agency and had become a tool of United States foreign policy inside of Nicaragua.

As proof of the Sandinistas' tolerance in the arts, he cites the publication in Ventana, the weekly cultural supplement of the official Sandinista newspaper, of an excerpt from Milan Kundera's novel "The Unbearable Lightness of Being." Kundera has lived in Paris since 1975, when Czechoslovakia's Government revoked his citizenship; his work is widely read as an indictment of totalitarianism and of the revolutionary euphoria that often precedes its establishment.

Ramirez says that he felt proud when Ventana published Kundera, even though Nicaragua has close ties with Kundera's greatest enemy, the Soviet Union. It was a symbolic act to publish him.

The Russian tanks were there, in his country. That's "a reality," says Ramirez. It is not, he adds, Nicaragua's.

Ramirez considers Cuadra a superb and nationalist poet, but says that Cuadra, prior to 1979, has "a romantic notion" of the Sandinista front and of the revolution. He didn't understand that the front's objective wasn't merely to remove Somoza from power, but to achieve a social and economic reordering of the society. As a member of "the old aristocracy," Ramirez argues, Cuadra naturally now opposes the Sandinista project.

The Sandinista revolution had the whole world on its side," says Pablo Antonio Cuadra. "We had a chance to mark out a true Nicaraguanidad. Instead, we've gone in the direction of Fidel Castro. Fidel could have been the leader of all Latin America, but, instead, sold himself to the Russians. We haven't had a real revolution here, because a revolution gives velocity to a historical destiny that's been coming along too slowly—our own historical destiny."

Don Pablo Antonio Cuadra—he prefers this traditional form of address—was born in 1912; he grew up in the decades of the Marine occupations. To his conversation about Nicaragua he brings the turned-down temperature of one who has seen his country endure too many calamities and dashed hopes to be persuaded by promises. An engaging man of old fashioned civility, in the context of contemporary Nicaragua he takes on the manner of an elder statesman.

As a young man, Cuadra was a vanguardist and early supporter of Somoza. Disillusionment, however, came quickly. He spent much of his 20's attending to his family farm.

Sometime around 1940—he no longer recalls the exact year—Cuadra began to edit La Prensa's literary page. In 1954, he was lured into fulltime newspaper work by Pedro Joaquín Chamorro, the paper's founder and editor and a lifelong enemy of the Somoza dynasty. A man of heroic stature, Chamorro's murder in 1978 sparked the popular insurrection. Cuadra himself was imprisoned twice by the Somozas.

The summer of 1986 found Cuadra staying in Guayaquil, Ecuador. This was not the beginning of exile. He had been attending a poetry festival in Florence, when La Prensa was closed, and he continued on to Ecuador to visit relatives. Last fall, he taught Central American literature at the University of Texas, in Austin. After that, he returned home, though there is little chance that La Prensa will resume publishing.

"One of the things I find most estranging about this Government," says Cuadra, speaking of the Sandinistas, in the salon of a well-to-do house in Guayaquil suburb, "is that they always claim to be against the very things they're doing. They say they don't want to shut La Prensa, but then they do it. It's strange. Why this theater?"

In an essay Cuadra wrote years ago, titled "Our Obscene Symbol of Deception," he posed this trait, along with the verbal extravagance and charm that help to make a great liar, as central to the Nicaraguan character. It doesn't apply only to the Sandinistas, but, Cuadra says, they are masters of it. He believes the Sandinistas to be Marxist-Leninists who "wore masks to advance themselves," and says that he originally supported the Sandinista revolution because "if you asked them if they were Marxists, they said no, we're Sandinistas, or Marxist-Christians. Now they're people who've denied their deepest convictions. Among intellectuals, there should be honesty about reality. Love things for their true name; that's one of a writer's duties."

Cuadra insists that La Prensa advocated a nonviolent solution to Nicaragua's problems that involved all sectors of the society. And he feels that the contra war can only lead to a permanently factionalized and fanaticized country, as in Lebanon and Northern Ireland.

"The tragedy is that men become seized by ideologies," he says. "Ideologies are poison. That's the conclusion I've come to. Ideologies are a substitute for religion. But religion is transcendent. It's man's relation to God that's important, tremendous. Incorporating that into politics produces fanatics."

Sergio Ramirez, once "a good friend," has been, says Cuadra, "one of the surprises of my life." Instead of exerting a moderating influence in the Sandinista front, Ramirez has taken the hard line, believes Cuadra. He says that his own work has been censored, as was La Prensa's literary page; several

young poets, he recalls, asked to have their work published anonymously in the newspaper, fearing that association with *La Prensa* might bar them from other publications.

The Sandinistas, Cuadra maintains, have subjected the arts in Nicaragua to a lowering of standards, a climate of conformity and intimidation. He bases this argument, put forth in the essay he published in *Vuelta*, on, among other things, two speeches given on the same day in 1980 by the Sandinista Commander Bayardo Arce Castano, who is not a writer, and Sergio Ramirez.

Commander Arce's speech on the arts that day contained the statement: "It must be remembered that art is worthless if it can't be understood by the workers and campesinos." The speech, says Cuadra, "is an example of the pedantry of power," reflecting the vainglorious conceit that "the revolution should guide everything."

What Cuadra took from Sergio Ramirez's speech that day pleased him no better. Ramirez's precise words were that Nicaraguan poets "had failed at creating an authentic culture, because Nicaragua wasn't an authentic nation." This has been a frequent Ramirez theme expressed in "Estas en Nicaragua" and elsewhere. His "authentic nation," the society the Sandinistas aim to create, has always been a place that, Ramirez claims, would be hospitable to poets, that would give them an elevated role in defining national identity—unlike Somoza's Nicaragua. He has repeatedly rejected "a recipe for the arts." And his position is at least rhetorically upheld by President Ortega, who refuted Commander Arce's Stalinist equation in a 1982 speech: Speaking about artists, he said: "If there is any advice we have, it is that they develop their imaginations, their creative capacities as they themselves see fit . . . free of any restrictions whatsoever."

Writing amidst the reality of censorship, however, Cuadra rejected the Sandinista position as another example of theater. "Arce . . . threw the first stone of tyranny," he wrote. "And to continue, Sergio Ramirez dynamited the past. Nicaraguan culture before the 19th of July, 1979, he said, 'is a failed historical project.'" This, wrote Cuadra, displays a totalitarian mentality, because Nicaraguan culture "has never been 'a project,' but life, agony."

Pablo Antonio Cuadra says that after the revolution the quality of Nicaraguan poetry went down, but now it is beginning to go up again. He is shown a list of contributors to a new magazine being prepared by two poets, members of the Sandinista Association of Cultural Workers' young writers union. "This is something new," Cuadra says, "but it doesn't surprise me." Several of the young people on the list are familiar to him; some have contributed to *La Prensa*. It is simply a list of names, nine young poets, but, Cuadra says: "It makes me happy. In the future we'll see more. I've always felt that the Nicaraguan has a great capacity to see his own reflection, to see the reality and save himself."

For the last year, Sergio Ramirez has been working on a novel, one that, he says, smiling, "has nothing to do with politics." But artistic freedom involves more than releasing writers from an obligation to propagandize—Cuadra, and many others, are not arguing merely for that. Ultimately, the more crucial question is whether the "freedom" granted to artists will be reflected in Nicaraguan society itself. The absolute nature of the Sandinistas' power to grant or deny that freedom arbitrarily was succinctly expressed

by Ramirez when, explaining the sources of his disagreements with Cuadra, he concluded, almost impatiently, "Now we're in power, and he isn't."

CONGRESSMAN DYSON EXPRESSES OUTRAGE OVER WEST GERMANY'S INDECISION TO EXTRADITE HAMADEI

(Mr. DYSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DYSON, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage over the proposal on the part of the West German Government to trade a known terrorist, Mohammed Hamadei, for West German hostages being held in Lebanon. For this reason, I have joined with Senator ALFONSE D'AMATO in introducing a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 94, to communicate the outrage of the United States Congress at recent indications that the West German Government will negotiate such a trade.

Mr. Speaker, we in the U.S. Congress have a responsibility to take quick action condemning any such action. Indeed, this case merits our immediate attention if justice is to be brought to bear. Evidence compiled thus far points to the overwhelming guilt of Hamadei for the torture and subsequent murder of a young American Navy diver, Robert Dean Stethem, on the ill-fated TWA flight 847, June 14, 1985.

It is unfathomable that the West German Government, which has been heretofore committed to the eradication of international terrorism, would actually allow the terrorist Hamadei his freedom to continue his bloody rampage throughout the free world. Clearly, this compliant gesture would further handicap our efforts against terrorism. Now, more than ever, is the time for America to show the world that we will not tolerate the practice of trading hostages for terrorists. We must all learn from past mistakes and go forward against terrorism with renewed resolve and vigor.

Accordingly, I am confident that my colleagues in the House of Representatives will expeditiously approve this resolution. The resolution will serve to convey a strong, clear message to the Government of West Germany condemning the release of an international murderer. The United States must never waver from its commitment to thwart terrorist activities—and I believe that this resolution is a step in the right direction.

WHAT MAKES SCOUTMASTERS TICK?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, W.A. Suggs of Memphis brought the following article to my attention. It was written by Dr. Nelms Boone, a clinical psychologist from Collierville, TN. It appeared in the *Collierville Herald* and pays special tribute to a group of unsung heroes in our society—Scoutmasters. I want to share it with my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the *Collierville (TN) Herald*, July 25, 1985]

BOONE TO READERS

(By Nelms Boone, Ph.D.)

Scoutmasters always puzzle psychologists. There are no psychological tests to administer to find out who would be a good Scoutmaster and I don't know any school that teaches Scoutmastering. It's a complicated job. Scoutmasters are fearless leaders, counselors, disciplinarians, and good cooks. Most are geniuses in boy behavior. They lead, push, and pull all kinds of boys from wet behind the ears Webelos to girl crazy seventeen year olds who still want to make Eagle Scout.

Scoutmasters are also experts with adults. The mother of a twelve year old still wants to pack his knapsack and fix his meals. Fathers promise to go on campouts with the troop and then alibi at the last minute. And there's the father who wanted to pass his son on the swimming merit badge in a backyard pool. Later at summer camp the Scoutmasters learns that the boy can't swim.

The Scoutmasters I've known have been good citizens who were successful at earning a living. They've taken a second job that requires talents and mountains of energy. They all have certain characteristics.

Scoutmasters are honest. I answered a want ad and brought a second hand truck over the phone—when I learned that the owner was a Scoutmaster. It's been a good truck.

Scoutmasters are friendly. My best friend is a long time Scoutmaster. I've heard five other people say that he is their best friend, too.

Scoutmasters are thoughtful. The first Scoutmaster I knew died when he was 90. He sent me a Christmas Card six months after his death. Since he hadn't been feeling well he addressed his cards in the summer and left them for his daughter-in-law to mail. He believed in the Scout motto "Be Prepared."

Scoutmasters are courteous. They don't put pressure on boys to learn how to cook. The scouts are permitted to cook the first time without instructions. After eating black, burned eggs they are not bored when he shows them how to cook.

Scoutmasters are courageous. They can say to an irate person, "Since your son is short one merit badge he is not a Second Class Scout and that means he can't go on the trip to Washington."

Scoutmasters are generous. I've never known a rich Scoutmaster but I've seen a poor scout who needed a uniform and didn't get it. A lot of anonymous financing goes on in most Scout troops.

Scoutmasters are loyal. There aren't any ex-Scoutmasters. They will always get back into harness and help out for a few days.

Scoutmasters are wise. I asked a hard working Scoutmaster, "Why do you do this, all your children are girls?" The weary man looked up from his battered World War II brief case where he was filing records and

replied, "I'm thinking about what kind of men my daughters will marry."

Scoutmasters are fortunate. They know how it feels to have a former scout, now grown, say, "Let me carry the groceries for you," when you don't really need any help.

If psychologists ever learn what makes Scoutmasters tick they will know a lot more about the good part of human nature.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS, at his own request, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HUBBARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUBBARD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LaFALCE, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DYSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHUETTE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DREIER of California.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. SHUMWAY.

Mr. DELLUMS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BEILENSEN.

Mr. FLORIO.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. COELHO.

Mr. VENTO in two instances.

Mr. LaFALCE.

Mr. VENTO.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following titles was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 477. An act to assist homeless veterans and their families by authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer or lease certain properties to non-profit entities for use as shelters, by requiring the Administrator to conduct a pilot program of activities to assist homeless veterans, to report on outreach services to such veterans, to conduct a survey of such veterans,

and to conduct a pilot program of contract community-based residential care for homeless veterans suffering from chronic mental illness disabilities, and by extending the Veterans' Job Training Act and expanding homeless veterans' eligibility thereunder; to provide for a one-year postponement of the transition period for the Vietnam-era veterans readjustment counseling program and related reports; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating June 1 through June 7, 1987, as "National Fishing Week";

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to designate "National Former POW Recognition Day";

S.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to designate May 1987, as "Older Americans Month";

S.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to designate the month of May, 1987 as "National Cancer Institute Month"; and

S.J. Res. 96. Joint resolution designating April 3, 1987, as "Interstate Commerce Commission Day."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to: accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 6, 1987, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of April 1, 1987]

1066. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report which discusses management problems at the Social Security Administration (GAO/HRD-87-39; March 1987); jointly to the Committees on Government Operations and Ways and Means.

[Submitted April 2, 1987]

1067. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the 1987 consolidated annual report on community development programs, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5313(a); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1068. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs, transmitting the 12th annual report of the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 3346(c) (1) and (4); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1069. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and amend programs under the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1070. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting notice

of a meeting related to the International Energy Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1071. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report on compliance with the international arms embargo against South Africa, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 5098; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1072. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's annual report of its activities for calendar year 1986 under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1073. A letter from the Chief Immigration Judge, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the grants of suspension of deportation of certain aliens of good character, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1254(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1074. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the 25th annual report of the Federal Maritime Commission for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1986, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1075. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend rules 3 and 27 of the Inland Navigational Rules Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-591; 94 Stat. 3415-3436; 33 U.S.C. 2000-2038) in order to conform them to the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1076. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal years 1988 and 1989, and for other purposes pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Science, Space and Technology.

1077. A letter from the Administrator Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide on call pay to certain civil service health care personnel; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1078. A letter from the Administrator Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Chief Medical Director or designee regarding disciplinary actions on certain probationary title 38 health-care employees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1079. A letter from the Administrator Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to index rates of veterans' disability compensation and surviving spouses' and children's dependency and indemnity compensation to automatically increase to keep pace with the cost of living and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1080. A letter from the Administrator Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide authority for higher monthly installments payable to certain insurance annuitants, and to exempt premiums paid under servicemen's and veterans' group life insurance from State tax

ation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1081. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the administration of veterans health-care benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1082. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the adult day health-care program and to authorize contract halfway house care for veterans with chronic psychiatric disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1083. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and clarify VA authority to furnish certain health-care benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1084. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the 49th quarterly report on trade between the United States and the nonmarket economy countries during 1986, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2440; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1085. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Institute of Peace, transmitting the report of the audit of the Institute's accounts for fiscal year 1986, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 4607(n); jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Foreign Affairs.

1086. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a copy of the Supplement to Special Analysis D, which provides projections of Federal investment spending and a review of recent public civilian investment needs assessments, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1105(a); jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Government Operations.

1087. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the administering of tort claims and hospital cost collections, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LENT, Mr. LOTT, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. QUILLIN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BATES, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COELHO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUSTER,

Mr. GALLO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MICA, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SUNQUIST, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WISE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CLARKE, and Mr. BONER of Tennessee):

H.R. 1917. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for a more gradual 10-year period of transition to the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977 as they apply to workers attaining age 65 in or after 1982 (and related beneficiaries) and to provide for increases in their benefits accordingly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 1918. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a service pension of \$150 per month for veterans of World War I and a pension of \$100 per month for certain surviving spouses of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEILENSON:

H.R. 1919. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the Federal deficit by increasing the tax on gasoline and other motor fuels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARPER:

H.R. 1920. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize former prisoners of war to use Department of Defense commissary stores and post and base exchanges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAUB:

H.R. 1921. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow monthly deposits of payroll taxes for employers with monthly payroll tax payments under \$5,000, to establish a Fair Trade Advocates Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Michigan:

H.R. 1922. A bill to improve the administration, management and law enforcement capabilities of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 1923. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require payments for physicians' services under the Medicare Program be made on an assignment-related basis; jointly, to the Committee on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DREIER of California:

H.R. 1924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the restrictions on retirement savings deductions added by the Tax Reform Act of 1986 and to allow up to a \$2,000 deduction for retirement savings for a nonworking spouse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1925. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the preferential treatment of capital gains, to eliminate the retroactivity in the repeal of the investment tax credit by the Tax Reform Act of 1986, and to provide for the indexing of the basis of certain assets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 1926. A bill to require that revenue collected by Federal agencies in the form of a user charge be obligated for certain programs which directly benefit persons required to pay such user charge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1927. A bill to provide relief to State and local governments from Federal regulation; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, the Judiciary, and Rules.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr.

McDADE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ECKART, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. TORRES, Mr. COOPER, Mr. OLIN, Mr. RAY, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CONTE, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GALLO, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. RHODES, Mr. UPTON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. RIDGE, Miss SCHNEIDER, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1928. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MAZZOLI:

H.R. 1929. A bill to establish a Federal Courts Study Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself and Mr. GARCIA):

H.R. 1930. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide protection under the Medicare and Medicaid Programs against acute and transitional care costs; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, and Mr. CARDIN):

H.R. 1931. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, with respect to patented processes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. RODINO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ROE, Mr. LELAND, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. LEVINE of

California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FISH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. TALLON):

H.R. 1932. A bill to amend part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to exempt the Pell grant higher education assistance program from sequestration; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia (for himself and Mr. JENKINS):

H.R. 1933. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit to the Congress a proposal for the regulation of long-term care insurance policies, including an analysis and evaluation of such policies as are available to individuals, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts for the purchase of long-term care insurance coverage by individuals who have attained age 59½; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COELHO, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. WEBER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. UDALL, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. WAGREN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. LELAND, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ECKART, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. YATES, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DIXON, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. MARLENEE):

H.R. 1934. A bill to clarify the congressional intent concerning, and to codify, certain requirements of the Communications Act of 1934 that ensure that broadcasters afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHUETTE (for himself, Mr. DAUB, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. WEBER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. McEWEN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

H.R. 1935. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make deficiency payments for the 1987 through 1990 crops of wheat and feed grains based on the first 5 months of the marketing years for such crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHUMWAY:

H.R. 1936. A bill to provide a uniform product liability law; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISISKY (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LA-FALCE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. RAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. OLIN, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PRICE

of North Carolina, Mr. CONTE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. GALLO, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. RHODES, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. RIDGE, and Mr. MAZZOLI):

H.R. 1937. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to establish a small Business Export Innovation Program to make competitive awards to small business concerns for the purpose of developing export trade strategies and knowledge essential for small business success in international trade; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 1938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for that portion of a governmental pension received by an individual which does not exceed the maximum benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act which could have been excluded from income for the taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VENTO (for himself, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. COELHO, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ROE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BATES, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1939. A bill to provide for continuing interpretation of the Constitution in appropriate units of the National Park System by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DARDEN (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. RITTER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DAUB, Mr. ROE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SABO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. COATS, Mr. MOODY, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FISH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FROST, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri):

H.J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to designate October 1987 as "National Down Syndrome Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FAZIO:

H.J. Res. 229. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit certain naturalized citizens of the United States to hold the of-

fices of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 118: Mr. BOULTER and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 308: Mr. ARCHER.

H.R. 545: Mr. WYLIE, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 593: Mr. PORTER, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. GREEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SABO, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 618: Mr. FUSTER and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

H.R. 782: Mr. GORDON and Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 907: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 1028: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HILER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.R. 1069: Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 1095: Mr. DAUB, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1141: Mr. BATES.

H.R. 1163: Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 1248: Mr. CARDIN and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1249: Mr. WEBER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 1290: Mr. BOSCO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. DIOGUARDI, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 1293: Mr. COELHO and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1352: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 1560: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 1583: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. RITTER, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 1598: Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

H.R. 1621: Mr. WAGREN, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. DE LA GARZA.

H.R. 1738: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1750: Mr. NEAL, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ERDREICH, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 1776: Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1782: Mr. FROST, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. WAGREN.

H.J. Res. 32: Mr. FUSTER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANIEL, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi.

H.J. Res. 67: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 119: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DAUB, and Mr. WELDON.

H.J. Res. 144: Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. CHAPPELL, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.J. Res. 152: Mr. LEWIS of Florida and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 154: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BATES, Mr. BADHAM, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. McEWEN.

H.J. Res. 158: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. CLINGER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WEISS.

H.J. Res. 190: Mr. ATKINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. DeLAY.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. WEBER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1777

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

—Page 55, after line 25, add the following new section:

SEC. 192. MEMBERSHIP OF BYELORUSSIA AND THE UKRAINE IN THE UNITED NATIONS.

The President shall instruct the United States Ambassador to the United Nations to introduce in the General Assembly of the United Nations a resolution to cease the recognition of Byelorussia and the Ukraine as members of the United Nations.

—Page 70, after line 13, add the following new section (and redesignate succeeding sections accordingly):

SEC. 601. REPEAL OF WAR POWERS RESOLUTION.

The War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.) is hereby repealed.

—Page 70, after line 13, insert the following new section (and redesignate succeeding sections accordingly):

SEC. 601. PARTICIPATION IN THE OLYMPICS BY THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON TAIWAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) for purposes of the Olympic Games, the International Olympic Committee recognizes both East Germany and West Germany, and both North Korea and South Korea;

(2) recognition of a national Olympic committee by the International Olympic Committee does not imply political or diplomatic recognition;

(3) the International Olympic Committee recognizes the National Olympic Committee of the People's Republic of China; and

(4) Taiwan considers itself to be a political entity distinct from the People's Republic of China.

(b) PARTICIPATION.—It is the sense of the Congress that the International Olympic Committee should allow the Republic of China on Taiwan to participate in the 1988 Olympic Games under its own name, flag, and national anthem.

—Page 70, after line 13, insert the following new section (and redesignate subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 601. REQUIREMENT OF TESTING OF VISA APPLICANTS FOR INFECTIONS WITH RESPECT TO ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME.

A consular officer of the United States may not issue an immigrant visa or a nonimmigrant visa to any individual unless—

(1) the individual is tested for the purpose of determining whether the individual is infected with the etiologic agent for acquired immune deficiency syndrome; and

(2) the results of such test indicate that the individual is not infected with such etiologic agent.

—Page 70, after line 13, insert the following new section (and redesignate succeeding sections accordingly):

SEC. 601. SELF-DETERMINATION OF THE PEOPLE FROM THE BALTIC STATES OF ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the subjugation of peoples to foreign domination constitutes a denial of human rights and is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations;

(2) all peoples have the right to self-determination and to freely establish their political status and pursue their own economic,

social, cultural, and religious development, a right that was confirmed in 1975 in the Helsinki Final Act;

(3) on June 21, 1940, armed forces of the Soviet Union, in collusion with Nazi Germany, overran the independent Baltic republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and forcibly incorporated them into the Soviet Union, depriving the Baltic peoples of their basic human rights, including the right to self-determination;

(4) the Government of the Soviet Union continues efforts to change the ethnic character of the population of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania through policies of Russification and dilution of their native populations;

(5) the United States continues to recognize the diplomatic representatives of the last independent Baltic governments and supports the aspirations of the Baltic peoples to self-determination and national independence, a principle enunciated in 1940 and reconfirmed by the President on July 26, 1988, when he officially informed all member nations of the United Nations that the United States has never recognized the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union; and

(6) the Soviet Union continues to deny the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania the right to exist as independent countries, separate from the Soviet Union and denies the Baltic peoples the right to freely pursue human contacts, movement across international borders, emigration, religious expression, and other human rights enumerated in the Helsinki Final Act.

(b) RECOGNITION AND ACTION BY PRESIDENT.—The Congress—

(1) recognizes the continuing desire and right of the people of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania for freedom and independence from the Soviet Union;

(2) calls upon the President to direct world attention to the right of self-determination of the people of the Baltic States by issuing on July 26, 1987, a statement that officially informs all member nations of the United Nations of the support of the United States for self-determination of all peoples and nonrecognition of the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union; and

(3) calls upon the President to promote compliance with the Helsinki Final Act in the Baltic States through human contacts, family reunification, free movement, emigration rights, the right to religious expression and other human rights enumerated in the Helsinki Accords.